

THE
SACRED BOOKS OF THE HINDUS

VOL. 22, PART 1

AMS PRESS
NEW YORK

THE SACRED BOOKS OF THE HINDUS

Translated by Various Sanskrit Scholars

EDITED BY

MAJOR B. D. BASU, I.M.S., (RETIRED)

VOL. XXII.

STUDIES IN THE VEDĀNTA SŪTRAS AND THE UPANISADŚ

PART I

STUDIES IN THE FIRST SIX UPANISADS

BY THE LATE

RAĪ BAHADUR ŚRĪŚA CHANDRA VIDYĀRĀVA

PUBLISHED BY

SUDHĪNDRA NĀTHA VASU

THE PĀṆINI OFFICE, BHUVANEŚWARI ĀŚRAMA, BAHADURGANJ,

ALLAHABAD.

1919

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Vasu, Sṛiśa Chandra, rai bahadur, 1861-1918?
Studies in the first six Upaniṣads.

Original ed. issued as v. 22, pt. 1 of *The Sacred books of the Hindus.*

Includes translations in English of the *Īśopaniṣad* and the *Kenopaniṣad*, with the respective commentaries of Śaṅkarācārya, the *Īśopaniṣadbhāṣya* and the *Kenopaniṣadbhāṣya*, and the commentary of Anantācārya on the *Īśopaniṣad*, the *Īśāvāsyabhāṣya*.

Includes some ślokaś in Sanskrit.

Intended to serve as an introd. to the author's translations of the Upanishads.

1. Upanishads. I. Upanishads. *Īśopaniṣad*.
English. 1974. II. Upanishads. *Kenopaniṣad*.
English. 1974. III. Śaṅkarācārya. *Īśopaniṣadbhāṣya*.
English. 1974. IV. Śaṅkarācārya. *Kenopaniṣadbhāṣya*.
English. 1974. V. Anantācārya. *Īśāvāsyabhāṣya*.
English. 1974. VI. Title. VII. Series: *The Sacred books of the Hindus*, v. 22, pt. 1.
BL1120.V37 1974 294.5'921 73-3814
ISBN 0-404-57822-5

Reprinted from the edition of 1919, Allahabad
First AMS edition published, 1974
Manufactured in the United States of America

International Standard Book Number:
Complete Set: 0-404-57800-4
Volume 22 pt. 1: 0-404-57822-5

AMS Press, INC.
New York, N.Y. 10003

STUDIES IN THE FIRST SIX UPANISADS;

AND

THE ISA AND KENA UPANISADS

WITH THE COMMENTARY OF SANKARA.

TRANSLATED BY THE LATE

RAI BAHADUR ŚRĪŚA CHANDRA VIDYÂRĀNAVA



PUBLISHED BY

THE PANINI OFFICE, BHUVANEŚWARI AŚRAMA, BAHADURGANJ,

ALLAHABAD

1919



THE ĪŚĀ-UPANISAD.

Among the Upaniṣads the Īśāvāsyā stands first. It is perhaps the oldest of them all. It forms a part of the Mantra portion of the Veda itself, in fact, it is the fortieth chapter of the White Yajur Veda, while other Upaniṣads are generally portions of the Brāhmaṇas. If the Mantra portions are older than the Brāhmaṇas, and they must be so, as the text is always older than the commentary, then there can be no doubt that this Upaniṣad is older than the Bṛihadāraṇyaka which, according to some, is the oldest of all. Many Mantras of this Upaniṣad are to be found in the Bṛihadāraṇyaka. Thus the traditional order of the Upaniṣads, with the Īśāvāsyā as the first, has an historical foundation. This Īśāvāsyā is perhaps the most mystical of all.

The eighteen verses of this Upaniṣad have not only taxed the ingenuity and the intelligence of the commentators, but are a perennial source of fresh interpretations, and a puzzle which every student of Upaniṣads must solve for himself, before he can usefully proceed further.

In the Ānandāśram Series alone some seven commentaries are given, and it would not be an exaggeration to say that hardly two of them agree with each other. These verses are a standing riddle like that of the Sphinx. It will not be out of place, if we make an attempt to explain these verses in the light of Theosophy—the key which explains so many puzzles of Hindu Mythology, the light which illumines so many dark and obscure corners of Indian thought. The explanations may appear far fetched and fanciful to a mind accustomed to interpret a document on strictly literal lines ; but if fanciful and far-fetched, they are not more so than the glosses of orthodox Pandits, and the ingenerations of Saṅkara's disciples.

The number eighteen is a suggestive figure—the Mahābhārata has eighteen Books ; the Gītā has eighteen chapters, and this first in the series of Upaniṣads has eighteen verses. Is there anything in this number eighteen, or is it a mere coincidence ? Ranga Rāmānuja answers it by saying that the whole of the Gītā is the expansion of these eighteen verses. We say yes, not only the Gītā but the whole of the Mahābhārata is based upon these eighteen verses. The number is mystic, and whenever employed in any sacred book, indicates that there is a hidden meaning underlying the apparent one, and that the reader should pause, reflect and meditate till he reaches the hidden sense. For, it is thus that his intuition can be brought into play.

This Upaniṣad teaches in its short compass the three-fold yoga, 1. The Path of Action, 2. the Path of Wisdom, and 3. the Path of Love or devotion.

The path of Action and Discipline is laid down in the first two verses, which when analysed give the following four rules of conduct :—

1. Meditate on the Lord of the World as an Eternal Presence—overshadowing all, as a vesture covers the man—indwelling in all, as the space pervades in and out.

2. Protect thyself through the Great Sacrifice made by Him. Constantly meditate on that Great Love which caused Him to renounce in the ineffable bliss of his Unity to limit Himself that the Universe may come into existence. Learn the truth about happiness through *tyāga* or renunciation.

3. Kill out ambition—do not covet anything—whether of this world or the next world—for the highest existence even, namely, that of a *Hiraṇya Garbha* is but a state, and if coveted, increases *Samsāra*. The seed of *Samsāra* is in the Desire. Kill out therefore this seed.

4. But in killing out ambition, do not become apathetic, lazy and a misanthrope. Kill out ambition, but work as those work who are ambitious. Do not covet any possessions, but perform Karmas always without any desire of reward, and performing such Karmas, desire ye to live the hundred years—namely the full *Kalpa* or Life Period of manifestation which consists of hundred years. Perform work *always* so long as this manifestation exists, so long as *Brahma* himself is awake and a-work. But perform all works with the mental attitude changed with no idea of personal gain, with no idea of reward, but simply as duty. This is the way, by which one transcends the wheel of causation, the Law of Karma.

III. But those who cannot perform Karmas in this spirit of utter selflessness are *asuras* [literally life (*asu*) enjoyers (*ra*)]—they are short-sighted people, or be they *Devas* or be they sons of *Manu*, because they cling to life, because they try to save their self, and thus they drop away from the Life Eternal, and love their true self, and are hence called slayers of self. Such *asuras* go to the region of deep darkness for the highest *Triloki swarga* is but deep darkness compared to the Light of Self, and the highest reward of a selfish worker is Heaven or *Swarga* in *Triloki*—all therefore who are in *Samsāra* are slayers of Self, for they do not allow it to manifest itself.

IV. But what is this Self which all *Samsāri Jivas*, all *asuras*, slay? It is one, a unit simple, and not a compound substance. It is motionless for there can be no motion in the absolutely simple. It has no molecular motion, because it has no molecules : but its own vibratory swing is swifter than that of the *manas*—it is the atom whose one vibration sweeps in no time over the whole universe. The senses (*Devas*) cannot comprehend it, for it constantly eludes their grasp, they always see it going in front, however fast they may run. It out-runneeth them all, though really staying still. In it the air (*Buddhi*) supports the waters, *Manas*. Hence it is called the triple *Ātmā*, for *Buddhi* and *manas* are included in it.

V. It moves all, but is itself motionless. It is nearest as the innermost core of our being and farthest too, it is within all and without all.

VI. The first step towards *Ātma jñāna* or Self-realisation is to see it in *Buddhi-manas*, union without unity. In *Buddhic* perception, the consciousness does not go out towards the "object" but the object appears as a modification of consciousness, the consciousness appears inside the object, the partition wall of subject and object is thrown down, and the truth dawns upon the soul that the subject and object—the knower and the known—are not different. He who sees all in the *Ātmā* and the *Ātmā* in all realises the first truth of Universal Brotherhood and does not hate any, does not criticise any. He sees every object floating in the luminous all pervading ocean of Self, and the Self reflected in all. Little globes of Light pulsating in the Light of the Eternal Sun; and the infinite Sun reflected in its infinity in the heart, in the centre of each globe. It is the state just preceeding unity. This expansion of consciousness is naturally followed by the total cessation of all hatred and disgust. To such a "percipient," hatred becomes impossible, because he sees Himself in all, and is in full sympathy with all. That which was a moral virtue before becomes now a necessity of his nature.

VII. This *Buddhic* perception in its turn leads to the *Ātmic* perception, the state of consciousness in which the self *becomes* all, not only is in all, but is the very essence of everything. The difference between the *Buddhic* and the *Ātmic* consciousness consists in this—in *Buddhic* consciousness the Ego vibrates at the same rate of vibration as the object to be perceived, and hence knows that object more fully than in *mānasic* perception. *Buddhic* perception may be called the perception through sympathy. He feels the joys and sorrows of others as his own. But the *Ātmic* consciousness is above this. In that state the *Ātmā becomes* the object or rather the truth is realised that the object *was* from eternity the subject, the partition wall created in lower consciousness between subject and object was a self-imposed limitation for the purposes of lower manifestation; but that in reality there never was any difference between them. This is the state of *complete* and *true* "knowledge," as *Buddhic* perception is the state of complete and true "Feeling." The result of this "knowledge" which is the state of true "Being" also, is the cessation of all sorrow, and delusion, for real sorrow there is none. The apparent sorrow is the response of matter to spirit, the throe through which the matter (on all planes) must pass to regain the pure state before manifestation, with acquired power of vibrating to the infinite modes of vibration of the All-consciousness. Pain really does not exist in the *Ātmā* which is all bliss, it exists in the vehicles—astral or mental. Obstruction to the full expansion of these vehicles makes them contract giving rise to pain and sorrow. In the *Ātmic* consciousness there is perfect expansion and full bliss.

VIII. When the Self-knowledge is gained, then the soul is purified of all taints of selfishness and becomes fit for God-vision. He then fully knows (*paryagât*), where he knew before but dimly, that God—the *Īśa* is radiant (*Śukra*), bodiless (*akāyam*), impenetrable (*avaraṇa*), but not rigid (*asṇāvira*) pure, untouched by sin. He is far seeing, Lord of thought, invincible and Self-existent. He ordains fitly every object through eternal years.

The unregenerate man thinks his dense body as his self. Let his body be hurt, he says: "I am hurt." Let his "feelings" be ruffled, he cries out: "I am insulted." He works for his separated self, he is moved by desire, and his mind is the intelligent but timid slave of his uncontrollable but domineering master, the desire. This lower trinity is to be purified by *karmas*—by penances to subdue the dense body, by eternal *pūjā*, by giving of alms &c., to purify the astral and mental bodies.

When this lower triad is purified—the "body" consciousness (*dehātma-vāda*) becomes the *viśva*-consciousness; where he called his little "body" as "I" he now calls the whole cosmos as "I," for his consciousness extends to all, embraces all. His personal feeling becomes the Buddhist feeling—Sympathy with all, and his slave-*manas* becomes the master-*manas*, and the man becomes truly a man. This is *jīvātma jñāna* which leads to *Brahma-jñāna* or God knowledge which embraces spirit and matter, the Higher and the Lower self. These are then three stages on the Path:—*karma*, soul—knowledge, and God-knowledge.

IX to XI. What is then the means of attaining soul-knowledge? Some say it is to be attained by *karmas* alone, and so are devoted to the performance of mere *karmas*. Others say it is got by mere meditations, and philosophic thought. But both are partially right, and therefore do not attain their end. The error of the *karma-vādins* is on a lower plane and there is not much danger in it, but that of the Philosophers is on a higher plane, and therefore more difficult to cure. If *avidyā*-followers go to blind darkness, the *vidyā*-devotees go to greater darkness. Both must therefore be combined, the *vidyā* with *avidyā*, theory with practice, *karma* with *jñāna*. Through full and perfect knowledge of *avidyā*, through full knowledge of matter, death is overcome. What is death? It is the breaking up of the *material* vehicle, be that matter of the physical or astral or of mental plane. Why does the vehicle break or become unfit for the dwelling of the soul? Because the molecules that form the vehicle are held together by the *karma* of the ego. As soon as the particular *karmas* for the suffering of which the vehicle was created by the Lord of *karmas* are exhausted, the vehicle has fulfilled its purpose and is no longer necessary, and so breaks up. But the performer of enlightened *karmas* gets vehicles which are not *karma*-made, but which he himself makes; they are no longer the prison-house of the soul, but the dwelling house of the tenant, he comes in and goes out at his will, and thus for him there is no such thing as death. He has learned to work consciously out of the body, and has learned what is death even before the falling away of body. Thus he crosses over death through enlightened *karma-yoga*, and through knowledge of the higher planes enjoys immortality, becomes a co-worker with the immortals. On every plane through *karma-yoga* he masters his vehicle, and through *jñāna-yoga* he works on the plane immediately above. In our present state of evolution, the astral and the mental are two planes on which the soul must learn to work consciously and thus evolve the full powers of the Self in the three lower worlds. The *vidyā* and *avidyā* are thus relative terms. To an ordinary person who cannot go out of the physical body at will, the *vidyā* will be the *meditation* forming the astral body, the knowledge of the astral forces, while *avidyā* will be the *karma* tending to purify the physical

body, and loosen its hold on the soul ; similarly a person who works consciously on the astral plane, but cannot go to the mental, will require a similar training. By avidyā (a subsidiary vidyā, knowledge or lower-knowledge of the plane), he must purify his astral body, and by vidyā or knowledge of the mental plane, he creates a mental body and becomes a co-worker with the denizens of the mental plane

XII to XIV. As the last three verses describe the combination of Karma-yoga with Jñāna-yoga for the full acquirement of soul-knowledge so these three describe the two aspects of God-knowledge. God is generally meditated upon either as a terrible Being punishing all, or as a loving father rewarding all. More worship Him through fear, a few through love. But God is not only the Destroyer but creator too. The true devotee sees in the act of destruction the loving hand of the father. The act of dissolution is the act of regeneration every breaking up of forms sets free the life, to get again a higher, nobler and more glorious form.

In the cosmic circle the downward current is sambhūti, the cycle of creation, the half of Brahma's day during which the spirit descends into matter, and fashions matter. The upward arc is the arc of asambhūti, destruction, in which the spirit loosens itself gradually from matter and develops its inward life by controlling matter. One is Pravṛtti mārga the path of karma, or action, the other is nivṛtti mārga, the Path of Jñāna or wisdom. Both are necessary for the full, complete and harmonious development of the soul. God therefore must be meditated upon in His two-fold aspects of creator and Regenerator.

The partial knowledge here is as dangerous as in the last triplet. A man who meditates on God as merely a God of Wisdom, above all matter, mixes the great teaching of life, and therefore falls into the glowing darkness of samsāra. But he who meditates on God, as an active Principle only, gets Prakṛiti laya or absorption into matter, a gloomier darkness, for it lasts for a kalpa.

XV—XVIII. God must therefore be meditated upon in His dual aspect. By such worship, the true Immortality is gained. By the wisdom aspect of God, death is crossed over. The worshipper by destroying all lower attractions that bind him to the wheel of rebirth, fixes his love on God alone and thus gets out of the influence of the Death-sphere. But by co-operating with God, working with Him as sambhūti, the Father of creation, he becomes an Immortal.

This Immortality in God is a higher kind of Immortality than that described in the last triplet. The immortality in soul is the stepping stone to the immortality in God.

But this is not all. Karma, Jñāna and Bhakti are not all. The perfect Karma is the harmonious Karma, developing equally body, heart and brain, the physical, emotional and mental bodies, it is the perfecting of the lower vehicles, drawing the *equilateral* triangle with the apex down. It is a sound man-perfect in his body, perfect in his feeling, perfect in his mind.

II.

This Upaniṣad has been the subject of several commentaries. We give the interpretation according to the three well-known schools—Advaita (Śāṅkara), Viśiṣṭa Advaita (Rāmānuja) and Dvaita (Madhva)

ŚĀṅKARA SCHOOL.

According to Śāṅkarācārya, this Upaniṣad should be divided into two portions, one addressed to the Tyāgis and Sannyāsins, those who have renounced the three-fold desires of sons, worldly wealth and future heavenly enjoyments : the second portion is addressed to those who have such desires. To the Tyāgis, the Upaniṣad teaches in verses, 3 to 8, that the whole universe should be considered as enshrouded by his own self and not to be different from the Self and that all things belong to the Self and are the Self, so that there should be no coveting of any one's riches. Those who do not realise this idea of Self really commit suicide on the higher planes, for they deny the attributes of the Self and thus, as it were, slay the Self. All who are not Brahma-jñāni are such slayers of the Self, and as a consequence they are born as Asurass. The term Asura does not mean demon here. It means all persons, from men up to the highest gods, who have not the knowledge of the Supreme Self. This is the punishment of those who have not realized the Self. The realization of the Self consists in knowing. That is, its absolute and relative state. As absolute, it is immutable and the only One Existence, all things and beings are its manifestations, or only reflections. In its relativity, it can be faintly understood only by comparisons and paradoxes, such as: it is swifter than the mind; the senses cannot grasp it, it eludes their hold; standing, it outstrips all; rooted in it, all the cosmic forces, physical, vital and psychic, energize the whole universe; it moves and yet it is motionless; it is near, yet distant; it is inside of all and it is outside of all such is the Supreme Self. The Sannyāsin must cultivate the idea of the solidarity of the whole universe, there is no such thing as a separate individual monad, the Self is in all and all is in the Self. When the idea of duality vanishes, there exists nothing but one grand, pure, omniscient, all-prevading, all-controlling Unity. Then the man learns universal brotherhood, and transcends all grief and delusion. This is the the highest end of man, 'param puruṣārtha.'

But those who are incapable of elevating their souls to these transcendental regions of pure thought, should perform the duties of their Āśram and their position in life. These duties vary according to the country, age and life of the individual. These duties can be learned from the śāstras and scriptures of all nations. The proper performance of these will confer a sort of immortality, resembling the immortality obtained by the knower of the Self. But there are four dangers to be guarded against by persons being in the world performing their daily round of actions. Sin and vice are of course out of the question, all must abstain from these. But in the performance of what is known as virtuous acts there are snares and pitfalls. Some think that their whole duty consists in praying to the gods (call them by any name, God, Hari, Allah &c) and that a man must always contemplate the attributes of God. Such persons may be called 'Upāsānāvādīs' or Devajñānis, others think that God can only be

propitiated by works and not by prayers, He does not want praises and hymns chanting, but active work. Such persons, therefore, are absorbed in works founding hospitals, digging tanks, feeding the poor, and performing the well-known 'Mahā-yajñās.' There is yet another class of men who are neither for prayers nor for charities and works. They say the great unknown, the 'Mūlaprakṛiti,' from which all this universe proceeds, should only be studied and worshipped,—their doctrine is that man should be one with nature and fulfil the purpose of nature. They may be called worshippers of the 'Avyakrata.' A fourth class of persons think that the worship of created nature is the highest object of life, their highest ideal is Hiranyagarbha, the universal life force. These are constantly absorbed in the cultivation of their psychic powers and developing themselves into great adepts. Thus these four types of good men—for all are relatively doing good work—may be represented as cultivating only one side of their nature to the detriment of the other. Thus the first class cultivate only emotion and do not develop volition; the second class cultivate volition at the sacrifice of higher emotion; the third class cultivate only reason by subtle analysis till they reach 'Prakṛiti'; they are the great theorists of the world, and the fourth are practical Yogis. The rewards of these different activities are different. The life after death depends upon the ideas of the person. Thus the first class of men, go to the regions of their respective gods after death. The worshipper of Christ will find himself in a state where he will see Christ all around him, and so with the worshippers of other deities. The second class of workers will go to the region of the Pitris, the great ancestors of humanity, always working, always active. The fourth class of men attain even in this life wonderful powers and can perform what are vulgarly called miracles; and the third class of men reach 'Prakṛiti Laya,' assimilation with nature. This is the highest state that a man can attain to by mere works without the knowledge of the Supreme Self. This state resembles very much the state of Mukti, because being one with Nature, he is free from all ordinary conceivable bonds. The 'śruti,' however, condemns all these one-sided activities, and advises men to combine them in their lives. The technical names used in the text for these four states are, 'Vidyā, Avidyā,'—'Sambhūti' and—'Asambhūti.' The śruti teaches that in combining these one may attain a state which approaches most closely to—'Mukti.'

This partial Mukti which the workers obtain, is reached by the path called 'Devayāna.' The chief difficulty with all works lies in this, that every work inevitably produces effects, therefore all Karma-kāṇḍins are tied down to the wheel of cansation and must be born and reborn again and again. The only way by which there will be absolutely no rebirth is by 'Brahma-jñāna.' But there is another state also in which there is no re-birth, namely the state where the soul reaches the 'Brahmaloka.' There the soul will remain till the end of the 'Mahā-kalpa.' This state also, therefore, may be called a state from which there is no return (Anāvṛitti); of course this is a state of comparative 'Anāvṛitti.' Now what is the sphere where the soul of the Karma-kāṇḍin will find this 'Anāvṛitti.' In this our solar system, we know as science teaches us, that the planets are cooling down and parting with their internal heat. The time will come, though millions of years hence, when our earth will become a dead mass

like the moon, incapable of supporting any life. The last orb to die out will be the sun. Thus the sun is the sphere where the soul must go in order to attain to the 'Anāvṛitti.' From the sun to the earth the connecting link is made by the rays of the sun, heat, light and chemical and vital rays. The soul to approach the sun must cross over this bridge of light thrown across between the sun and the earth—this is called the 'Archinādi mārga.' To enable him to reach there, the soul prays to the presiding deity of the sun, called the 'Satya-puruṣa.' It is the highest manifestation of the Self. This Puruṣa is not visible to ordinary mortals, the photosphere of the sun, the veil of light, effectually conceals it. Modern science has not solved the mystery of the sun; it has analysed only the rays that reach the earth. The existence of beings in the sun, showing etherial bodies, though sounding like a fiction, is not improbable. After death the souls of the good are clothed in an etherial body and rise to the sun; the physical body and the Lūṅga Śarīra being left behind. The physical body is consumed by fire, the Lūṅga Śarīra is dissipated and dissolves itself into the Universal Life Force called 'anila' or 'Hiranyagarbha'; all therefore what goes to the solar sphere is the soul clothed in Kāraṇa Śarīra. This body persists throughout ages and is not shaken off until one attains the supreme knowledge. This is a short 'résumé' of the doctrine taught by this Upaniṣad as explained by Śrī Sankarāchārya.

The question which the reader will naturally ask is, whence does Śaṅkara read all these ideas into this simple but grand peroration of the Yajur-Veda. In answer, we would refer him to the Commentary translated herewith. Whether it will satisfy him or not is another question. This Upaniṣad, however, has been understood in a partially different way by Śrī Anantāchārya. According to him it does not teach that the renunciation of works is the only means of emancipation. For salvation there is only one way, namely, knowledge of God. But this knowledge does not manifest itself or arise in the heart of a man polluted by sin. To remove the taint of sin, it is absolutely necessary that Karmas should be performed. The doing of Karmas without any hope of obtaining rewards, the performance of duty because it is duty, without any idea of gain—is the only means of purifying the heart. The heart being thus purified, there spontaneously arises in it, or it is fitted to receive, the knowledge of God. The acquisition of this knowledge is thus the second stage of development. The third or God-vision, the direct perception of God not only theoretically knowing his attributes, but practically seeing him, is the next stage.

The fourth stage is emancipation which no longer depends upon human exertion, but upon the grace of God. Not that even the first three stages depend upon human exertion, for there even one must constantly pray to God to help him to perform good works, to cleanse his heart and open his eyes to see Him. Grace, Divine grace, is the last word of this Upaniṣad, as the final prayer shows. It teaches the harmonious blending of duty with devotion, and the cultivation of a spirit of reliance on and complete resignation to the will of the Almighty. Let my readers choose between Śrī Śaṅkarāchārya and Anantāchārya as their souls may prompt.

The two Adhikāris-Jñāni and Karmin :—

Knowledge and Ritualism, Jñāna and Karma, are diametrically opposed. They cannot be combined. The man who is the Adhikāri (entitled) to Jñāna or Wisdom cannot perform Karma, no more than light can co-exist in the same space with darkness. This Upaniṣad is addressed to both classes of persons. The first verse is addressed to the Jñānādhikāri—he is told to contemplate the whole universe as pervaded by Brahman, to renounce all and have no desires. The second verse is addressed to Karmādhikāri—the soul not yet fit for knowledge. He is told to perform Karmas, always to discharge scrupulously all the religious duties. As the first verse is for the Sannyāsin, the second is for the house-holder. This however is not his goal. This house-holder is told in the third verse that the result of all Karma is Aśra-hood—births and births again and again. This warning will in time lead the Karmādhikāri even to the Path of knowledge.

Ātman :—

What is the Jñāna ? It is the knowledge of Ātman. The verses 4 to 8 describe this Self. It is the unconditioned and the absolute, and hence all apparent contradictions find their reconciliation in it. It is motionless but swifter than the mind. It is sitting but out-strippeth all who run. It is the up-holder even of the First Breath that stirred up mother-space (mātariśva) and it is through it and because of it that the First Breath maintains all creators of different cosmic systems. This Brahman is near us all and far away too. It is within and without all. The true knowledge consists in seeing everything in the Ātman and the Ātman in everything—this realisation makes one love all, and not to feel repulsion even towards the ugliest and the most revolting—for Ātman is in that too. For this Ātman is all-pervading, resplendent, pure, all-knowing and transcendent.

Avidyā and Vidyā : Theory and Practice :—

But the Karmādhikāri is not fitted for this Divine illumination. He must perform the religious ceremonies such as Agnihotra &c. But there are always two ways of doing a thing—one intelligently and one mechanically. Karma will produce its effect, however performed—nectar will renew youth whether one drinks it knowingly or unknowingly. This is one view of Karma. But the Upaniṣad does not approve this view. True, the Karmas performed mechanically produce some effect, but they would be more efficacious if performed intelligently. How is that to be done ? That consists in the knowledge of the Devas and the Forces that govern the universe. For ceremonies performed without such knowledge carry the person to Pitri-loka only : with knowledge they will carry him to higher lokas where he will enjoy kalpic immortality. The Vidyā must be combined with Avidyā, the Theory must be wedded to Practice, Theology to Ritualism, Science to Art in order to be the most potent factor in the evolution of the Ego and the attainment of happiness and power. This the Upaniṣad teaches in verses 9 to 11.

Science and Religions :—

A similar idea is expressed in the three verses 12 to 14, under the Name of Sambhūti and Asambhūti. All who are Karmādhikāris, who are

"workers"—may be divided into two classes :—Those who cultivate material sciences—and those who study religion (in its lower form) The worshippers of *asambhūti* or the unhorn matter are the Scientists. the worshippers of *Sambhūti* or the Born or the manifested God are the ordinary followers of every religion. There has always been a conflict between Religion and Science, but the true progress of Humanity depends upon the co-operation of these two. Science must be the handmaid of Religion. Entire devotion to each separately is not to be approved of. By entire devotion to Matter (*Prakṛiti*) the man attains a sort of *laya* or absorption called *Prakṛiti-laya*—a state of perfect "rest" lasting for a *Kalpa*. By the one-sided devotion to "God" without studying Matter, one may attain the power of performing "miracles", but that also is rather a greater hindrance than anything else. Such a person, worshipped as a "prophet", "a saint" &c. is more likely to become spiritually proud and thus hinder his progress for ages to come. The proper corrective to all religious enthusiasm is a study of Nature. Both must be combined—scientific precision to religious enthusiasm, the miracles of Theurgy with the miracles of Science. When both are combined then the man retains his consciousness in *Prakṛiti-laya*. For the highest result that could be achieved according to the *Sāstras*, by wealth of men and the *Devas* is absorption into *Prakṛiti*—for that is the utmost limit of *Samsāra*. But this *Prakṛiti-laya* itself is of two sorts—conscious and unconscious. The latter is the fate of the pure worshippers of *Prakṛiti* devoid of "God". With God worship, this absorption instead of becoming a death-like trance, becomes a vivid reality—an immortality of ages.

The path of Karma :—

What is then the highest goal of all *Karmādhikāris* and by what path do they go there after death? The Solar *Pūrusa*, the *Logos* of our system, is the supreme Goal to which all *Karmins* aspire. But the Sun Himself is but a veil to the True—His (Sun's) light but darkness covering the Eternal Light of Truth. Having reached the end of all works, the *Karmin* prays to the Sun to reveal to him the Highest. The *Devayāna* Path leads up to the Sun : and there the Self goes in the *Linga Śarīra*.

RÂMÂNUJA SCHOOL

Īśa the Puruṣa .—

This Upaniṣad teaches Brahma-Vidyâ. Its eighteen verses are the seed, as it were, of the eighteen Chapters of the Gîtâ—in fact the latter may be considered as an expansion of this Upaniṣad. The Supreme Puruṣa spoken of in the famous Puruṣa Sûkta of the Rîg Veda (X. Maṇḍala) is the Īśâ of this Upaniṣad. It describes the nature of that Param Puruṣa, the mode of meditating on Him, and the means of attaining Him.

The Upaniṣad is part of the Mantra portion of the Veda. Though, as a general rule, the Mantra portions of the Vedas are ceremonial, the Āraṇyakas being the special sub-division where Brahma Vidyâ is taught, yet the inclusion of this Upaniṣad in the Mantra portion is for the sake of showing that Karma and Jñâna must be combined—and that though all Karmas are generally Avidyâ, not so those that are parts and limbs of Vidyâ. Some of these verses are to be found in the Brâhmana (Āraṇyaka) portion of this Veda also, that is, in the Brihadâraṇyaka Upaniṣad.

Man not free, but in God .—

Ordinary persons owing to the excess of their Râjasic and Tâmasic qualities, think themselves to be independent of God—free agents, not standing in need of anything else—their actions all spontaneous, their wills not determined or conditioned by any higher Will. The very first verse of this Upaniṣad removes this false notion. It teaches that the whole Cosmos of Chit, (sentient) and Achit (Insentient), life and form, of Spirit and Matter, is under the control and direction of the Lord—the Īśa, the Puruṣa. The whole universe is established in Him as its firm basis. Because He dwells (*vas*) in all, and all dwell in Him, hence He is called Vâsudeva. The God alone being truly free, all else being dependent upon Him, the aspirant for freedom must, if he is wise, leave off all lower aims, should covet nothing, ask or pray for nothing from any lower being—but always address his prayers and aspirations to the Supreme Lord. In the worldly government, the higher the ruler, the greater is his distance from the ruled—not so in the Divine Government. In the spiritual hierarchy, the greatness of a being is measured by his nearness to other beings, God being the Param Puruṣa or the Highest Person, is consequently nearest of all, and easiest of approach. All should, therefore, try to realise and approach Him. All worldly objects are small, impermanent, rooted in sorrow, mixed up with sorrow; even the highest worldly joy has its little dross of sorrow; they are sources of sorrow, all strengthen the idea of egotism, and prevent the realisation of the Supreme bliss. Realising this, one should discard all worldly attractions: and use all things merely for the sake of maintaining his physical activities. He must not covet any sort of possessions—friends, wife, children, father, mother, servants—to all these he must be dead. He must acquire the true Vairâgya.

Karmas never to be renounced :—

The man who has thus realised the permanency of Īśa (Lord) and the transitory nature of all worldly objects (*jagat*), learned Vireka and Vairâgya,

discrimination and indifference, should not however renounce Karma-Yoga : for it is an *anga* or part of Brahma-vidyā. The second verse, therefore, ordains the performance of Karmas. The Nitya and Naimittaka duties must always be performed, but with the additional mental attitude of Viveka and Vairāgya. The average human life being of 100 years, a man should throughout his life perform his duties. The Jñāna-yoga and Karma-yoga are life-long, the Karmas which are subsidiary to Vidyā should never be renounced.

Vidyānga Karmas never bind :—

But are not all Karmas bondages ? If a knower of Brahm perform Karma, will he not be bound to the wheel of causation ? If so, there can never be any freedom. To this the Śrūti replies—No, Karma does not bind such a person. The word *nara* (generally translated as man) is a very significant word in this verse. It is a compound word derived from न रमते* “he does not take pleasure” He who does not find pleasure in fruits of Karmas is a Nara. A Nara is therefore never bound by Karma. To a real Brahma-knowing person, the Karmas performed as Vidyānga are not bondages—they do not lead him of necessity into Heaven-world &c.

On the contrary, such Karma-yoga leads naturally to Jñāna-yoga which is the Yoga appertaining to the Pure Ātmā and the Jivātman—the Yoga of knowledge, the knowledge of the Higher and the Lower Self, the Infinite Holy God and the stain-purified Man, and their mutual relationship—and this gives rise to Bhakti Yoga, the Yoga of love, for the direct vision of God is the parent as well as the child of Bhakti.

The whole Upaniṣad is addressed to all men, there being no distinction of the wise and the unwise in it, no teaching that the foolish worldly people alone should perform Karmas, and the Jñāni is above all Karmas. Such an interpretation is against the spirit of the whole Upaniṣad, which throughout teaches the union of Vidyā and Avidyā, Karma and Jñāna.

The Three Tatvas—God, soul and matter :—

The first two Mantras, therefore are the key to the whole Vedānta Theosophy ; they teach the Three Tatvas, Īśvara, Jīva and Prakṛiti—God, Soul and Matter, and the injunction to perform Karmas conducive to wisdom.

The fate of Āsūric soul :—

But always opposed to the spiritual (daivi) Sampat souls are āsūric souls in the world. There is hardly any system of creation in which these two sorts of souls do not exist. While the first two verses relate to persons endowed with Daivi Sampat, the third verse describes the fate of persons born with Āsūric nature, persons who do not understand or who misunderstand the Three Tatvas, who are full of passion, anger, greed &c., who perform Yajñas contrary to Śāstric rules and for selfish ends, and who do prohibited acts. Such persons

*विद्याविद्वेषु कर्म फलेषु न रमते “Who does not take pleasure in fruits of Karma opposed to Vidyā.”

are called "Slayers of self" Punishment is their sure fate, and they suffer it in hells called Naraka. These Narakas are in all the three Lokas—on earth, in Antariksa (astral world) and in swarga also. Selfish persons, the performers of Kāmya Karmas, go to heaven—but there also they have not unalloyed bliss. For all places of enjoyment wherever they may be, are by their very nature places of suffering also. Hence the supreme necessity of acquiring Vidyā, Divine Wisdom, knowledge about Brahman.

God the Highest Tatva :—

Brahman is the most difficult of comprehension as well as the easiest. All paradoxes become axiomatic truths when applied to Brahman. Thus He is one and unshaking. There is none equal or superior to Him,—even the Mukta Jivas, though His equals in many respects are still subordinate to Him. He is swifter than the mind. The Gods even do not comprehend Him or reach Him, though He is with them from before the beginning. Though all creatures are in Him and every day go to Him (in Susupti) yet they know not that they have been to Him. Though others may be running as swiftly as possible, yet He outstrippeth them all by His simple calm presence, sitting He outrunneth all, for He is in every place from all times, being the Antaryāmin Puruṣa. It is through Him that the invisible air (the Great Breath) upholds all the visible universe, suns, moons, and stars—the incorporeal sustains the corporeal, the Air upholds the Water, the subtle lifts up the gross.

The God, therefore, though nearest to us is farthest from us so long as we do not acquire illumination, and cultivate Divine Sampat. So long as our nature is Āsuric, He must always appear far off from us, nay, we may even deny His existence. Not only is He within all, He is beyond all.

Universal Love :—

The practical result of even an intellectual appreciation of his Truth is that the man learns universal tolerance and love: for seeing the Supreme Self in all beings and all beings in Him, he no longer blames any body—their faults are his faults, their imperfections his imperfections, they are his, and he theirs. This idea is thus the basis of all true ethics and morality—it substitutes co-operation in the place of competition. The idea of self-preservation or struggle for existence—the idea of "jujugupsā"—protecting (gup 'to protect') himself, preserving his little self, gives place to the broader idea of brotherhood and communion.

Matter and Soul the body of God. Cessation of sorrow :—

This is not all. When this idea is realised in Samādhi—when a man knows that all beings are verily the Self, when it is no longer mere intellectual assent but spiritual intuition, then vanish all griefs and all doubts. Brahman should be thought of not only as that in which all beings exist and who is in all, He must be further realised as the Self of all, the idea of duality must give place to unity, the idea of diversity should be replaced by uniformity, things—which appeared many before are found to be expressions of the One. But this unity is not the unity of identity, but it is the unity of solidarity, the unity of an army of many individuals working as a single body, being the perfected vehicle or instrument of the Will of the Commander. the whole army "corps" being

not only figuratively but literally the body of the General commanding it, the intelligence working through the various units composing it being the intelligence of the General. Similarly when the whole humanity is realised as the body of God, the Supreme Man, and that all men but His instruments, and that One Will works through them all, then vanish all sorrow and all perplexity. The apparent miseries and sufferings, so inexplicable and heart-rending, appear in their true place and proportion, as subserving the One purpose, furthering the One Will. This beatific vision of onity is the great comforter, and this realisation of God-pervasion the remover of doubts and difficulties. Great troubles may befall that man, but he meets them all with a serene brow, they come from the beloved, they can never be evil. Great difficulties may beset his path, he goes to them undaunted and without perplexity, for he has learned his insignificance and mastered the lesson of reliance on that Lord. He no longer thinks himself as the warrior, the true Warrior is born in his soul to encounter those enemies and conquer those foes. He becomes a Jivan-Mukta and may well exclaim with Janaka.

अनन्तं वत चित्तं मे यस्य मे नास्ति किञ्चन ।

मिथिलायां प्रदिग्मायां न मे किञ्चन दह्यते ॥

The illumined soul .—

The man who thus sees Brahman as the Inner Self (Antarātman) of all beings, he attains Brahman the Supreme, the self-resplendent, whose body is eternal, spotless, not liable to corruption, decay, dissolution or division, nothing can wound that body as it is not made of blood and muscles like the ordinary bodies of all creatures. His form is the most auspicious “Kalyāna-tamam” (v. 16), it is luminous (hiraṇ mayā ‘golden’) it is not made of Prakṛitic matter. He is pure, free from all taints of evil, above the Law of Karma. The wise seeing the Brahman thus, himself becomes a world-teacher, a poet, a prophet. with no break in his memory, for through the practice of Yoga, his manas being purified, he becomes the Śuddha Jīva.

Karma Yoga leads to Jñāna Yoga :—

After having taught the Kauma-Yoga in verse two, the Upanisad now teaches in the second part of Mantra 8 the Jivātma-Yoga, the knowledge of soul and its mysteries, and the mind-control, through Jñāna-Yoga, which is the means of realising the Pratyagātman. The aspirant must bring his Manas under the control of Buddhi his Antahkarana should be made calm and quiet by constantly meditating upon the great beauty and goodness of the Lord and indifference to all other things, he must become a Manisī, must centre his manas in his Buddhi. He must conquer his passions and desires, anger and envy, greed and covetousness. He must become self-reliant, constantly delighting in the bliss of his self. Fully retaining in his heart the meaning of Great Word (Om), he should constantly recite it (Japa), and meditate on its significance. He must practise this Jivātma-Yoga for eternal years, till Brahman is realised.

Karma and Jñāna both necessary :—

The next three verses (9-11) teach that neither Vidyā alone nor Karma alone is desirable. The highest end of man is not to be attained by an exclusive devotion to any one singly ; Karma must be supplemented by Vidyā, Karma-Yoga by Jivātma-Yoga. The performers of Karma-Yoga alone go to “blind darkness” that is the Samsārā, the round of three worlds. The exclusive devotees of Vidyā enter into greater gloom.

The way to attaining Mokṣa is different from Vidyā and Karma both—it is the harmonious working of these two that leads to Mukti. Karma-Yoga with Jñāna-Yoga generates Bhakti (Divine Love) by revealing Pratyagātman, as taught in the previous Mantras. The works that were previously performed as mere duties because so commanded by precepts of religion are now, when Bhakti-Yoga is attained, performed as loving tribute to one's Beloved—and by such loving service, the same Karmas which first generated Bhakti-Yoga, now go to accumulate and strengthen it.

First the performance of Karma without hankering after reward, then the mind control and thought regulation, these two lead to Divine vision ; thus Karma-Yoga with Jivātma-Yoga leads to Bhakti-Yoga. But the aspirant must not stop here : he must combine Karma and Jñāna in order to strengthen and increase his Bhakti. The word Avidyā here means not the opposite of Vidyā, but that which is *similar* to Vidyā though not exactly Vidyā, just as the word Abrahmana does not mean a person opposite to Brāhmaṇa, but one who is next in rank to a Brāhmaṇa, namely the Kṣatriya. Avidyā therefore means the knowledge next to Vidyā, namely that Karma which is conducive to Vidyā or which is Vidyāṅga. By the help of such Vidyāṅga Karma, “death” is overcome, namely all the “obstacles” to the path of true Vidyā are removed, all the stored up past Karmas, demerits and merits, are exhausted. Then by Vidyā, by the worship of the Supreme Self,—immortality is obtained, the man becomes liberated. The two verbs “crosses over” and “enjoys” refer to two different ideas. The first refers to the crossing over the obstacles which are opposed to the *means* and the second to the freedom from all sins which prevent Brahma-attainment, the *end*. The one refers to the obstacles to the “means” and the other to the “end.” For the accomplishment of any object, two things are necessary, a right knowledge of the ‘means’ to be employed, and a right conception of the ‘end’ to be attained. Avidyā denotes the lesser vidyā, the knowledge of the proper ‘means,’ and Vidyā signifies the right conception of the ‘end,’ the end here being the attainment of Samādhi, and the means thereto the due performance of Nitya and Naimittika duties without desire of fruit.

Nivṛtti Yoga to be combined with Pravṛtti Yoga :—

The next three Mantras teach the subsidiary Yogāṅga—the negative virtues. The attainment of Samādhi is called here Sambhūti—the higher birth. Asambhūti denotes the means to the attainment of that Samādhi—the cessation of prohibited qualities, the destruction of evil tendencies. Hence another name of Asambhūti is Vināśa also, the Nisiddha-nivṛtti. Pride,

haughtiness, cruelty, covetousness, &c., are obstacles to Yoga, their eradication is *Asambhūti*, the "death" of the lower self

Those who are engaged in the destruction of their lower self, in the cultivation of this negation, go to blind darkness, but to greater darkness do they go who are devoted to *Samādhi* alone. A man who cultivates the negative virtues alone is at the worst a harmless creature, but a person who plunges into *Samādhi*, lets himself loose on the higher planes of consciousness without proper moral training, with pride, haughtiness, greed, &c., still rampant, incurs greater risk, may become a black magician. The *Mokṣa* is not to be attained by either *Samādhi* alone or negative Virtue alone. Both these should be combined—moral training and spiritual intuition, by moral training, the obstacles to *Samādhi* are removed, by spiritual intuition immortality is gained.

A Prayer for purification :—

Having thus taught the *Bhakti-yoga*, with its generating qualifications, *Karma* and *Jñāna-yogas*, the *Upanisad* in the next two mantras teaches the *Bhakta* the prayer to the Lord. In mantra 15 the Lord is addressed as *Pūṣan*, the all nourisher, the *Antaryāmin* of the Solar Logos, and is invoked to remove the obstacles to *Samādhi*, so that the True may be seen. The True means the True *Jīva*, the *Jīva* purified of all its taints. The face of the *Jīvātma* is concealed by the "golden disk"—the Auric Egg, the body of *Karma*, the store-house of past experiences, the *Kāraṇa Śarīra*. This veil must be removed, in order that True (*jīvātma*) may be seen. The face is *Manas*, it is overlaid with *Karmas* so that *Jīvātma* cannot shine through it. The Lord is therefore invoked to steady this *Manas* by removing its defects, so that it may become concentrated : and the freed *Jīvātmā* in *Samādhi* may see the *Paramātmā*. Thus there are two veils really to the True—the "face" or the *manas*, and the "disk" or the auric egg. This verse, therefore, is the prayer for self-purification—the granting of *manas*-concentration, the *chitta-vritti nirodha*, and the removal of latent *Samskāras* that prevent such concentration, and which obtrude themselves uncalled for at the time of meditation. The repetition of this mantra quiets the mind, harmonises its vibrations, removes the old impressions latent in the recesses of *manas*, and produces *Samādhi*.

The Beatific vision :—

When *Samādhi* is obtained, and the purified *Jīvātma* stands before its Lord, can it face that glorious Presence, has it the power to look into that countenance whose light transcends that of hundreds of Suns concentrated on a point? Ah no! That Presence is too splendid even for the *Jīvātma* stripped of its *Manas* and *Kāraṇa* bodies to gaze at : and hence the *Bhakta* prays to him saying :—"O Nourisher ! O One and the Seer (of all), O Controller ! O Prompter of *Buddhi* on the right Path ! O Lord of creatures, withdraw Thy fiery rays (which prevent me gazing at Thee), collect Thy light rays. I want to see Thee, as *Arjuna* and others did in ancient times : that form of thine which is the most auspicious, beautiful and lovely—that form may I see.

The Lord has body :—

Has then Brahman a form visible to human eyes? If so, what then of the Śrūtis which declare that He is bodiless, without hands he grasps, without feet he walks, &c? True, Brahman has no body like ordinary Jīvas—namely He has no हेय शरीर "Heya-Sarīra"—body conditioned by Karma. But all the same He has a Divya Body—the Kalyānatamam rūpam of this mantra, the Hiraṇmaya, Puruṣa of the Chhândogya,—the Golden Man, the Person of Light. The Śrūtis that declare Him to be "bodiless, without Guṇas, without name, Truth, mere knowledge &c." are to be understood in the sense of negating a body like that of other Jīvas—be they Devas or men. For this is the only way of reconciling the apparently conflicting Śrūtis.

God the only Male :—

The mantra then declares the highest mode, the Ahāṅgraha upāsana, the worship in which the devotee identifies himself for the time being with the object of worship, the lover unites himself with the beloved, the bride with the bridegroom, the soul which is as it were feminine with the God who is the only Puruṣa or Male in the universe, and in that state of ecstasy cries: "Yah asau asau Puruṣa, sah aham asmi—Who That that Puruṣa—He I am." The curious construction of this sentence, the two "Asaus" and "Yah"—all point to the fact that it is the incoherent utterance of an ecstatic devotee, in the condition when the glory of the Beloved makes every thing vanish, even his own Self.

The Refuge :—

Having thus taught the discrimination between the Higher and the Lower Tatvas—between Īśvara on the one hand and Jīva, and Matter on the other, as well as the Bhakti-yoga with all its ramifications—the yoga of liberation, the yoga that leads to the highest end having also taught the two mantras which every Bhakta must constantly meditate upon, the last two mantras proclaim the means of salvation for those who are treading the Path of Bhakti, but possess not the strength or ability to acquire Jñāna—the countless souls who have taken refuge in the Lord, depend entirely on Him, who have neither the ambition nor the inclination to scale the heights of Jñāna (spirit) or the depths of Avidyā (matter)—the Innocents, the Infants. The last two verses of this Upanisad are the शरणगति मन्त्रौ "Śaraṇāgati-mantrau"—the mantras of seeking refuge and asylum, the hymns of absolute resignation and God-reliance. These two verses also describe the three Tatvas—namely (1) Chit or Bhoktā or Jīva i. e. Spirit, the Enjoyer, the Jīva; (2) Achit or Bhogya or Prakṛiti,—matter, or the Enjoyed or Nature; (3) The Īśa or the Ruler, the God, the Ordainer or both.

The mantra 17 therefore declares :—"There are these three, the Soul (Vāyu) supportless and immortal, the Body, (achit, inherently changeable and) reducible to ashes and (the Third the Īśvara)—the Great Anm. O (Lord of) Sacrifice, remember me, (have mercy on me), remember (my good) deeds (if any, but forget as it were the evil deeds that I have done.) O Sacrifice! remember, deeds remember."

Forgiveness of sins and Grace .—

In the last verse, the Lord is entreated to take the soul by the easy path to regions of the blest “O God (Agni) ! lead us by the blessed Path to the (imperishable) treasure (Thy own self,) for धनं मदीय त्व पादपङ्कजं—thy lotus feet are my wealth and riches. O Agni ! O Deva ! thou knowest all our thoughts—remove thou all our crooked sins. For ever and ever we sing Thy praise and make salutation to Thee with humble adoration.

Thus this short Upanisad, though consisting of only 18 verses, is really the essence of all Theosophy, teaching the Three Paths of Karma, Jñāna and Bhakti, declaring the Three Truths—Matter, Spirit and Lord the correlation between the Three Paths and the Three Truths, the Path of Karma penetrating the mysteries of matter, from Bhu to the Satya loka, the Path of Jñāna probing the depths of consciousness from that of the lowest atom to Supreme Brahman, and the Path of Bhakti offering one's self in full abandonment to the Beloved

In the first eight mantras, the two lower Tatvas are described i.e., the Spirit (Chetana) and matter (Achetana)—the subject or the conscious, the object or the unconscious. They further describe the two-fold yoga appertaining to them respectively—the Jñāna Yoga or the Yoga of Spirit, and the Karma-Yoga or the Yoga of matter—controlling the forces of matter and the forces of Soul.

In the second eight verses (9 to 16) the supreme Purusa, the Highest Tatva, is described, with the Yoga of attaining him—i.e., the Yoga of Bhakti, the means of realising Him by direct vision.

The remaining two mantras describe the means of attaining all fruits through the prayer for Divine Grace and mercy. Thus there is analogy between this Upanisad and the Bhagavadgītā. The first six chapters of the Gītā are, as it were an expansion of the first eight verses of this Upanisad. the second six chapters of the same are of the second eight verses, and the last six chapters of the Gītā are expansions of the last two verses of this. For the last six chapters of the Gītā teach the way of total reliance upon God and how to take refuge under him.

Thus this Upanisad teaches the truth about the Supreme Substance (Para Tatva), His Powers, His contemplation—and worship, offering oneself to Him with full resignation to His Will, and the fruits thereof.

MADHVA SCHOOL

The Upaniṣads, when first presented to the scholars of the West, through the Latin translations of M. Anquetil Duperron, evoked an amount of enthusiasm perhaps second to none. But the aspect of the Upaniṣads that the West learnt, was the Philosophical side of them—the side whose ablest exponent in India was the great Śaṅkarāchārya. The religious and devotional aspects of these Revelations were never brought into prominence before the Western scholars, and many forget that they have any such side. The great Vaiṣṇava teachers like Rāmānuja and Ānanda Tīrtha (Madhva) were exponents of the religious and devotional sides of these heirlooms of humanity. The masses of India are saturated with these Upaniṣad teachings in that aspect only.

There are scarcely however any translations of these Upaniṣads in English in this light. Therefore the writer has already published in the Sacred Books of the Hindus a translation of these books from the religious and devotional points of view, according to the school of Madhva Āchārya, which covers a different field altogether—a field not much known to the public either in the East or the West.

Madhva was the great teacher of the dualistic Vedānta. He was born, according to Mr. Kṛṣṇa Svāmī Iyer, in 1199 A. D., but according to Mr. Kṛṣṇa Śāstry, 1238 A. D.* His death is shrouded in mystery. He is said to have been touring in his last years (that is, towards the close of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century) in the Sub-Himalayan regions from which he never returned. During the Middle Ages, Sanskrit learning took shelter in Southern India—all the great reformers and founders of the different schools of thought, generally hailed from the South. Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva, Śāyana, &c., were all Southern Brāhmaṇas. Madhvāchārya appears to have received a liberal education. In those days a knowledge of Persian was considered to be a *sine qua non* of an enlightened scholar. It is surmised that Madhva knew Persian and held discussions in that language. The horizon of view of Madhva was consequently wider than that of purely Sanskrit scholars.

The Upaniṣads were employed by Śaṅkara as a weapon to fight the Buddhists. He, therefore, naturally ignored or kept in the background the doctrines of faith and devotion and prominently laid stress on those texts which afforded an answer to the rationalistic atheism or agnosticism of the heterodox sects passing under the name of Buddhism, Jainism, &c. When Brāhmaṇism was again established in India—the time came to revive these peculiar doctrines—essential features of every devotional religion. Madhva had not, therefore, far to go for them. The doctrine of Monotheism is in the Vedas, but later innovations had thrown it into the background.

All religions, if they are religions and not merely man-made medley of morality, ethics, philosophy and rhapsody—are from God, as all poetry is from the Higher Self, if it is not a mere versification. All religions, therefore, must have all the elements of truth, more or less well defined. Some religions, in the course of their development, lay more stress on one aspect or element of Truth, and put the others in the background, while other religions bring forward some other element. Thus arise all their differences.

* See Madhva and Madhvaism by G. N. Krishna Swami Aiyer, M.A., p. 15

But as all living creatures—vegetables or animals—have one protoplasm for their bodies—so with all religions. They have one basic body of Truth called the Veda in India

As Madhva points out this Upaniṣad contains the great ineffable name of God, i.e., "I AM THAT I AM".—"SOHAM ASMI". In the Zoroastrian Faith also this is one of the most secret names of the Lord, as is shown in the following extract from Hormuzd Yasht:—

Then spake Zarathustra Tell me then, O Pure Ahuramazda, the name which is thy greatest, best, fairest and which is the most efficacious for prayer

Thus answered Adhuramazda My first name is Ahmi—I Am— * * * and my twentieth is Ahmi yad Ahmi Mazdao—I am that I am (Avesta, XVII, 4 and 6)

This too was also the most secret name of God among the Jews, as we learn from the Old Testament, Exodus, Chapter III verses 13 and 14

"And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the Children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, what is his name? what shall I say unto them?"

"And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM and he said Thus shalt thou say unto the Children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you."

Thus among the Israel also both these names were well-known—God is called "I am" or Ahmi of the Pārsis, and Asmi of Madhva; and also "I am that I am," the same, word for word, as "Ahmi yad Ahmi" of the Pārsis, and So'ham Asmi of Madhva.

Another point which Madhva clearly brings out is the indwelling of the Lord in Asu. Now Asu is a word derived from *√as* 'to be,' 'to breathe.' Asu means 'life,' 'breath,' or Prāṇa. It is the First Begotten of God, the Spirit. The God dwelling in Asu is called Asura (or Ahura of the Pārsis)—the Active Saguna Brahman. This Asu or Prāṇa is the Christ-principle of the Gnostics. These strange coincidences cannot all be accidental. They prove that all prophets—whether Zarathustra or Moses or Madhva—were messengers of the Great White Lodge: and so naturally taught the same doctrine. In fact, Dr. Speigel is of opinion that the word Ahura (the principal name of the deity in the Zendavesta) is identical in meaning with the word Jehova. Ahura literally would mean the Lord of Ahu or Life or existence. The word "ra" means "who takes delight in." It is Ahu or Asu or Christ in whom the Lord takes delight, and through whom and by indwelling in whom the whole universe is created. Ahu or Asu is also the name of God, and Asura would mean "The living delight"

Another keynote struck by Madhva is his interpretation of the triplet verses 9—11. He enunciates the great altruistic doctrine, so gloriously illustrated in the lives of all great Teachers, that a great responsibility rests with him who knows. He is bound to teach others in order to dispel the ignorance of the world: otherwise his lot is even worse than those of the ignorant

According to Madhva, the Rṣi who first saw this Upaniṣad and revealed it to humanity is Svayambhuva Manu. The Devatā is Haṁ called Yajña (Sacrifice). Its metres are various like anuṣṭup &c.

The Lord the Devotee:

The first verse describes the necessity for the destruction of the desire for external things in order that one may be qualified for Higher Knowledge. It also gives the reason why thirst for objective experience should

be given up so that a man may become a true Adhikāri. Whatever object that draws out or attracts the soul to external activity, whatever incites it to the Pravṛtti path, all that is the fitting habitation of God, for God is in that. Because God is in the object therefore it possesses its attractive power over the Soul : therefore love God, the true Attractor, and renounce all objects, for they are merely the forms through which God manifests His beauty in order to teach the Soul. Do not run after the objects as objects, but enjoy them as the gifts of God, as some sacred and holy thing in which God dwells, and which should not be polluted by lower desires. Learn contentment and be satisfied with whatever comes providentially from God ; do not beg from any one in power or position—from no King or Prince. None but God is the real Giver, all others are merely the channels through which his gifts flow to all—the instruments, conscious or unconscious, of the Deity. None has independent power of giving except God—so pray to God alone.

Duty must be done :—

II. Not only thirst for worldly objects should be destroyed, but the seeker of wisdom must perform the duties proper to his station in life. Even performing all Karmas, let him wish to live, for a hundred years—namely so long as there is in him this desire to live, whether as a man or a Deva ; so long as he thinks that life is sweet and worth preservation, so long he must perform Karmas, must discharge his duties, however unpleasant. Up to its death he must perform Pūjā of God, in fact he must dedicate his *whole* life to the service of God, and work without desire of fruits, without determining the result, but work because it is his allotted portion of work. Thus performing all works, even the lower Adhikāri is bound by the Karmas, and in time becomes fitted to become the Adhikāri of Jñāna. By not performing Karmas in this spirit of resignation, or—total—renunciation, the man incurs sin. The man who through ignorance gives up the worship of God, does not fit himself for Wisdom. The ordinary men must therefore never give up Karma, for it is the stepping-stone to wisdom. But the Jñāni also must perform Karma, for if he fails to do so, there is a diminution of his ānāda (joy), even though he may be a Mukta—and thus the “sin” of non-performance of Karmas attaches to a Jñāni also. Hence the Śruti emphatically declares :—“Performing even here all works, as sacred service of the Lord, let him his wished-for life on earth, of hundred years or more thus pass. For thus in these, though but a man, the work its stain will not produce. There is no other way than this.”

Misled souls and soul-slayers :—

III. The third verse describes the fate of those who entertain a false notion of Self and Íśvara—the object being to induce the Adhikāri to acquire the true knowledge and shun the false. Hence the mantra declares : “Verily there are those worlds of grief, with blinding darkness shrouded all : towards them after death they go, who are the slayers of their souls.” The “slayers of their souls” are those who not only do not understand the true nature of their Souls, but who positively entertain a wrong notion about it.

The nature of the Lord :—

IV & V. The fourth and fifth verses teach the truth about the Paramātmā—the Supreme Soul—the Íśvara. They declare. “He is fearless,

Supreme, than mind more quick Him the Devas did not know in full, but He from beginningless time knows all Motionless, he out-strippeth all who strive Inconceivable is His power and all-pervading is His essence In that Hari, the Chief Air upholds all Karmas—awards the fruit of Karmas to all living creatures, being impelled thereto by Him Of Him in awe the world doth shake, but He unshaken ever is Far off is He, and yet so near, within this all, beyond this all is He”

The nature of Mukti :—

VI & VII The God being the container of all creatures is consequently the goal of all and the pervader of all What is the fruit of God-knowledge ? The mantras say —“ But, who all beings (sentient and insentient—‘ chit ’ and ‘ a-chit ’) even in the Supreme Soul doth see and the Supreme Soul in all (as their controller)—by this firm faith seeks not to save (his soul, trusting full in ever-watching God).”

“ In whom all beings dwell, verily He is the inmost of all souls as well”—thus knowing, where is there grief, delusion where ? For he has felt the unity of God-head—for he knows that the Ruler of all forces externally is one and the same as the Ruler of the internal consciousness of Jīvas Realising thus the unity of the Lord, he transcends all grief and sorrow. This is mukti or liberation

VIII. How does the mere knowledge of God destroy all grief and delusion ? To this the Śruti replies :—The knower of God reaches God ; having reached All-bliss where can grief be ; having attained the All-knowledge, where can there be delusion ? Therefore the Śruti declares :—“ He (the wise thus knowing) Him (the reached Lord)—the Grief-less, Passion-less, Full-eternal, Unembodied, Pure, Unpierced by sin”—and because of this reaching, the wise loses all grief and perplexity But if God is bodiless, how can He be the creator—for—embodied beings only can create ? To this doubt, the next half of the Śruti replies —“He is Omniscient, Ruler of all Thinkers, Controller of all, Self-existent, He ever fashions truly every thing throughout beginningless and endless years ”

The creation of all things is therefore ‘ real ’ (Yāthātathyatah—really truly) creation, and not merely an illusion imposed upon the consciousness of Jīvas by the will of Īśvara The creation moreover is not a transformation of the essence of Brahman The Lord moreover is ‘ constantly ’ creating—‘ śāśvatibhyah, samābhyaḥ —through eternal years Not that He created at a particular moment in time, assumed a body for the purposes of that creation, and then took rest and threw aside that body The current of creation and destruction is beginningless, endless and active in every moment of time

Conjoint cause of Mukti

IX—XI By using the words “ knowing (Vijānataḥ) ” “ feeling (anu-
paśyataḥ) ’ in the previous two verses, the Śruti has declared that the true knowledge of the Supreme Soul is the cause of Mukti These three verses declare that the real cause of Mukti is the knowledge in one’s self of the Supreme Soul and the correction of false knowledge in others—a combination of these two, and not mere knowledge alone A man may acquire a knowledge of Brahman, but if he through indifference, selfishness or pure apathy keeps that

knowledge to himself and does not correct the false notions of his less intelligent brothers, he is not entitled to full Mukti. The correction of false knowledge is therefore as necessary as the acquisition of true knowledge. For the load of false knowledge is heavy indeed and leads the soul to regions of grief as described in verse three; but the duty imposed upon the possessor of true knowledge is heavier than that, for if he fails to correct and condemn such false knowledge, he goes to, regions of greater grief. Hence the Śruti says.—

“To blinding darkness enter they, who wrongly understand the Self; but sure to greater darkness than these, they go, who in mere knowledge take delight.

“Partial (liberation) is the fruit of mere knowledge and partial of correcting false knowledge—this from the wise ones have we heard, who to us this path of Mukti did explain.

“The true knowledge of God and the correction of false knowledge—he who knows both these as the ‘joint’ cause of Mukti—by correcting false knowledge, he crosses over death (lessens the quantity of sorrow and ignorance &c) and by true knowledge of Viṣṇu gets joy eternal.”

Thus the fruit of condemning false knowledge is the removal of all under-obstacles, and clears the way while the attainment of true knowledge gives joy.

An Illustration.—

XII—XIV. False knowledge leads to all sorts of disasters and undesired and undesirable results, while true knowledge alone is the cause of Mukti. This idea is illustrated by one concrete example.

“To blinding darkness enter they, who non-creator meditate (denying that there is a Lord who is the Maker of creation), out greater yet that darkness whither go they who to sole creator are espoused.

“One sort is fruit of devotion to non-creator, they say, and to creator another sort. This from wise ones have we heard, who this truth to us explained.

“Of Him who knows conjointly both—Creator and Destroyer—Destroyer removes his death obstacles, and Creator gives immortal joy.”

By knowing Him as Creator—by knowing His infinitely auspicious attributes one experiences bliss; and by knowing Him as Regenerator (hence Destroyer) there is a total cessation of the infinite varieties of pains and hindrances. Hence both are necessary for complete Mukti—God must not only create, but must constantly destroy too, for further, higher and better creation. There is no ‘dual’ principle in nature—one creator, and the other destroyer—both are aspects of the One Sach-chidānanda.

XV—XVII. The first two mantras have described the qualifications necessary in an Adhikārī, and the goal of his efforts; verses four and five describe the nature of the Supreme God, the verses six and seven and half of the eighth declare the nature of Mukti—the God-vision which is the cause of salvation. This God-vision, this Realisation of Divinity cannot be obtained by mere study or Yoga or religious exercises—though they are all necessary. This depends only and absolutely on His Grace, can never be claimed by anyone as a matter of right, but must be begged by all as a matter of grace and mercy.

Hence the necessity of 'prayer' to God—not prayer for worldly gifts and enjoyments, not prayer for the removal of pain and suffering, for Karmic debts must be ungrudgingly and cheerfully paid, but the sole prayer to the Lord to unveil His glorious Face to our vision, to show His ineffable Beauty to our thirsting Souls. The verses 15 to 17 describe the method of prayer.

"The luminous disk (of the sun) conceals the face of the True. O Pûṣan! O All-pervader! Reveal that face to the sight of the Truth-bearer (me)—I, lover of the True, am anxious to see Thy face, remove the veil of Light and reveal Thy glorious Body. O All-full, Sole-Omniscient! O All-Judge! O Goal of the Wise! O Goal of the Prajâpati Hiranyagarbha! Expand my knowledge of the Self (Rays) and increase my knowledge of the non-Self (forces of external nature), So that I may, through Thy grace, behold that most auspicious form of Thine."

Not only is the Lord the Antaryâmin Puruṣa of the Solar Logos; but He is the Antaryâmin Puruṣa of the Universal Prâṇa also. Hence the mantra further goes on to say:—"That Lord is in the Life (Prâṇa) also. That Puruṣa is the Supreme "I am" (A-ham = not-ham = not-heyam = not inferior). His name is Asmi "I Am" 'Aham' does not mean "I", but is a compound of the negative particle 'a,' and of 'ha' the shortened form of 'heya'; here it means the Supreme. So the word "Asmi" is not a verb, but an Indeclinable-particle—सदास्मित्वेन मेयत्वादेव न प्रसज्यते इति प्रतिष्ठापक-प्रत्यय-पदवाच्यः—"That which always 'is' (asti), and—is 'measured' (mi) or known by the fact of His always existing, is called Asmi—"existence measured"—The Supreme I AM—"The ultimate standard of Be-ness."

How can the Jiva be Immortal when we see it visibly dying? To this the Sinti replies:—

"When the Vâyu by relying on God has an Immortal here become, how can then my soul e'er die, though my body to ashes all (must) turn? The God who has given an Immortal Existence to an Element like Vâyn, because 'It' has no other support but Brahman, and hence is called anila (a—Brahm, nila—Support), will He forsake me, his devotee, and a sentient being as well. Certainly not, for those who take refuge in Him become Immortal.

Then the Soul prays to the Lord in the form of Praṇava "O Om! O All-protector Hari! O Kratu (All-knowing)! Have mercy on me. Remember my deeds (like meditation, pûjâ &c)

XVIII. When the God-vision has taken place by praying in the afore-said manner, then the soul prays still for strengthening the Bhakti.

"O Leader of all bodies (Āngam nayati—agni)! lead us by a good path (from which there is no return). O God! thou knowest all our efforts to attain Mukti. Remove from us all sins that are obstructions. We shall always hail thee with the word "namah."

OM ! TAT SAT.
ĪŚAVĀSYOPANISAD.

ŚĀṆKARA'S INTRODUCTION.

The verses "Īśāvāsyam" are not employed in (ceremonial) works- ('Karmas'), because they reveal the true nature of 'Ātmā' which is not the completion or resultant of (any sacrificial) works. The true nature of 'Ātmā' is explained by words like "purity," "untouched by sin," "unity," "invariability," "incorporeality," "all-pervadingness," &c, to be taught hereafter. And this true nature is contradicted by acts, hence these verses are inapplicable to sacrificial works.

An objector may say : cannot these verses, by establishing the true nature of 'Ātmā' possessed of these qualities, be taken as conducing to the completion of an action either as generating, or evolving, or attaining, or purifying, or in the shape of actor and enjoyer ? This is answered by saying that all Upaniṣads only treat of the true nature of 'Ātmā.' So also have the Gītā and other books treating of 'Mokṣa-dharma' this object in view.

Therefore, considering 'Ātmā' as more than one, as agent, enjoyer, &c., and as impure, as touched by sin&c., have there been ordained various ceremonial works to be performed by worldly intellects.

He who desires fruits of action, visible fruits like the attainment of 'Brahmā's' power ('Siddhis'), &c, or invisible fruits like Heaven, &c, and who thinks himself entitled to perform sacrifices by such notions as "I am a twice-born, I am not born blind, or back-backed, &c, which disqualify one from performing sacrifices," such a person should be engaged in sacrificial works ; so say those who know the fitness of persons.

Therefore do these verses, by revealing the true nature of 'Ātmā,' by removing the innate ignorance as regards the 'Ātmā,' give rise to the complete knowledge of the unity of 'Ātmā,' which is the means of destroying sorrow, delusion, &c, the attributes of the world. Thus, having described who is a fit person to study this science, what is its subject-matter, what is its relation to the preceding parts, and what is its necessity ; we shall now briefly explain the verses themselves.

ANANTA'S INTRODUCTION.

Salutation.

(1) I take refuge in 'Hari' who is the one only subject-matter of all the 'Vedas,' 'who is the' crest-jewel of all Gods, who is infinite as regards space, time, and attributes. (2) In this fortieth chapter of the 'Yajur Veda,' is the investigation of the Supreme Self by those transcendental attributes which free him from grief, sorrow, and delusion.

This chapter beginning with 'Īśāvāsyā' has no applicability to sacrificial works. But it establishes the true nature of 'Ātmā' by its attributes of purity, unity, untainted by sin, incorporeality, all-pervadingness, and the like. It reveals the true form of 'Ātmā' to a person who has fitted himself to receive

this teaching by having first purified the inner organ with the due performance of all ordained duties ; and it thereby removes Ignorance, the mother of grief and delusion, and shows the true form of the Self. Thus shall we show its four Anubandhas, viz., the subject of the treatise, its object, its relation, and the 'Adhikâri.'

Of the verse 'Īśāvāsyā,' &c., the deity is 'Ātmā,' the metre is 'Anuṣṭup,' and its Rīṣi is 'DadhyanĀtharvan.' The seer with the intention of imparting instruction, addresses the following verses to his son or pupil, seeing that he, the son or pupil, is a fit 'Adhikâri,' by reason of having performed purificatory ceremonies of 'Garbhâdhân' and the like, has studied the 'Vedas,' has begotten sons, has performed sacrifices according to his means, is free from sin, is free from desires, is endowed with the virtues called 'Yama' and 'Niyama,' is a sincere seeker of liberation, and has approached him, the teacher, for the sake of learning.

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

1. By (one's own Supreme 'Ātmā' as being the inner soul and) Ruler (of all), is to be clothed all this whatsoever that existeth in the world (since these are all false appearances, the 'Ātmā' being the reality). By (the realisation of) this (idea), (the unreal world of itself will be renounced). And by (so) renouncing. (and knowing that thy 'Ātmā' is the God) shalt thou save thy soul. Covet not (nor entertain the desire of possessing any) riches of any one.

ĀNANTAS RENDERING.

1. All this is dwelt in, created, preserved and regulated by the Lord, all that existeth in the world, whether it be perceptible by the senses or known through revelation. Therefore, enjoy thou all things that have been specifically allotted to thee by the Lord according to thy merit. Covet not more than that, for by so doing, thou rebellest against the will of the Lord that hath fixed thy destiny. This being the case, whose are riches, but the Lord's ?

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

1. 'Īśāvāsyā &c., 'Īśā' is the instrumental case, singular number of the noun ईश 'Ruler,' from the verbal root ईश्; Īt is equivalent to 'Is-itā,' the Supreme God, the supreme spirit of all. He verily rules ('iṣṭe') all, being the 'Ātmā' of all creatures, by His being the inmost Self. By Him, i. e., by one's own Self, by the Lord ('Īśā') is to be covered ('vāsyam'). What is to be covered ? All this ('yatkñichidam sarvam') The word 'yatkñicha' is an archaic form of 'yatkñichit,' meaning whatsoever. 'Jagatyām'—in the world : 'Jagat'—moving. All this should be enveloped by one's Self, which is the Lord, i. e., with the thought of this highest truth, एहं, I am all this, being the inmost Self of all." By himself, which is the Highest Self, should be covered all this false immovable world, as sandal or 'agaru' by its sweet scent covers or perfumes the bad smell produced by putrid matters in water, by

overpowering the evil odour : similarly, also by contemplating on the eternal verity of Self, is removed the false notion imputed to the Self that it is an agent, an enjoyer, &c., causing the idea of duality, and producing in this world the various modifications having name and form and action. The word " world " is here illustrative, meaning everything that exists.

So also is a person who contemplates on the Lord as Self fit for renouncing the threefold desires of possessing sons (wealth and heaven), and he is not fit for ceremonial works 'Tena tyaktena'—by renouncing it (the word 'tyakta = tyāga'). A dead son or a servant may be said to be 'tyakta,' or left, as there is a want of relationship to the Self, but it cannot save the 'Ātmā': but it is by renunciation ('tyāga') alone that it is saved, hence the word 'tyakta' (left) here is taken as equal to 'tyāga' (renunciation), and not literally 'Bhūñj;sthā=pālayethāh,' &c., meaning 'thou shouldst protect, or protect thou.' Thou, having renounced all desires, covet not (mā gridhah), i. e., do not entertain thoughts of acquiring wealth. 'Kasyasviddhanam'—do not desire to obtain the property of any one, whether of a stranger or thy own. The word *svid* in the text is an indeclinable used as a mere expletive without any meaning. Or it may have a meaning in this way : Do not covet, why ? 'Kasyasviddhanam'—whose is the property, i. e., no one can have property, that one may covet : (*svid* having the force of an interrogative). All this is 'Ātmā' only ; by such divine contemplation, is everything renounced, because all this belongs to the Self only, and the Self is verily all this.

Therefore, covet not these unreal substances.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

1. 'Isā' is a verbal root meaning to rule, adding to this the affix 'kvpī' (the whole of which affix gets elided), we get the noun of agency *Īś* (nom s. ईश), meaning the Ruler of all, 'the Supreme God'. He, verily being the soul ('Ātmā') of all creatures, rules ('īṣṭi') all. This whole universe, proved to exist by reason of perception, should be enveloped by Him—the Ruler, the Supreme God, the Self. The word 'vāsyam' comes from the root (वृ) to cover ('adadi' class), the affix 'nyat' is added to this root by Sūtra III 1. 143 of Pāṇini, and the indicatory letter *y* of the affix makes the word so derived to have the circumflex ('svariṣ') accent. All is to be covered by Him, i. e., is pervaded by Him. As the *Śruti* says.—"He is below, He verily is above." "The Nārāyaṇa stays pervading all this both in and out," &c., or the word 'vāsyam' may be derived from the root 'vas'—to dwell ('bhuādi,' class) when the meaning will be—'all this is dwelt in ('vāsitam'), i. e., produced, preserved and regulated by the Rule, the Supreme 'Brāhman.'" Thus the *Śruti* says "He from whom all these creatures are born, and by whom all that are born remain alive, &c.," "He who controlleth all this, He is the inner controller, the Immortal, &c."

Not only is the universe known through perception to be so enveloped by the idea of the Ruler, but also the whole cosmos in its concealed state as well ; and therefore the text says 'yatkiñcha' "whatsoever," That is, whatever exists in this world, though not perceived, but proved to exist by Scripture. The sense is that

the whole universe, movable and immovable, perceptible or imperceptible, has been created, preserved, and regulated by God. For this reason 'enjoy' ('bhûñjithâh') thou, i.e., experience thou all enjoyments (sufferings), that have been thrown out ('tyakta') or allotted or ordained to thee in accordance with thy destiny by Him ('tena'), the God. Be not greedy for more than what is so given. The word 'gridhah' comes from the root 'grdhu' to be greedy, to covet ('Divâdi' class). That is covet not thou, i.e., renounce the idea from thy heart "O let me have more than what I have got;" because such an idea or wish of thine is abortive, simply because thou art under the control of the Supreme Spirit (who has allotted to thee thy full measure). When this is so, then whose are the riches? That is of no body: the riches all belong to the Lord. The particle 'svid' is interrogative. For thus the Śruti declares 'He is the controller of all this, He is the commander of all, He reigns over all this whatsoever, that existeth'. The purport of the whole is that dispassion ('Vairâgya') should be cultivated by the thought that the Principal Giver is God only, and not any other living being who is temporarily invested with the proprietary relation or title.

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

2. (But if thou art not capable of renouncing, then duly performing merely here these sacrificial works, like 'Agnihotra,' &c., as taught in the previous chapters) desire thou to live for a hundred years. In this way (O thou who cannot conceive thyself to be the Supreme Spirit but thinkest thyself to be human), wilt thou escape the taint of inauspicious works, there is no other way of preserving one-self from inauspicious works.

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

2. Performing sacrifices without any motive of reward, wish thou to live in this world for a hundred years; never renounce works: for thy salvation lay in thus doing thy duty. There is no other way to salvation: for works performed with the object of gaining salvation are not bonds like 'Kâmya' works: but they are the instruments of salvation that purify the mind.

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

2. Thus should the knower of Self, by renouncing the threefold desires of sons (wealth and heaven), and by devotion to the realisation of Self, protect (or save) his Self: this is the sense of the first Vedic verse. Now for that other person, who on account of non-knowledge of Self is capable of apprehending or conceiving the Self, the second verse teaches as follows:—'Kurvanneva,' &c.—by simply performing the sacrificial acts, such as 'Agnihotra,' &c., let him desire to live ('jijivîset'), for a hundred years ('samah' years) for this period has been ascertained to be the average age of man. He who is desirous of living a hundred summers, verily must perform sacrifices: this is ordained by way of explanation. By such methods, in thee ('tvayi'), i.e., to thee O man who art desirous of living, who imaginest thyself as a mortal, from this ('itah'),

i.e., whilst engaged in the performance of sacrifices like 'Agnihotra,' &c., from the present method, there is no other method, by which inauspicious deeds should not 'besmear' and contaminate thee. This is the sense of the words 'karmanā nalipyate.' Therefore let him desire to live whilst performing the sacrifices ordained by Scriptures, such as 'Agnihotra,' &c. How, again, is this meaning deduced from the text of these 'Mantras,' which say that by the first verse is taught the devotion to knowledge ('jñāna') for a 'Sannyāsi' (who has renounced all desires) and by the second verse is taught devotion to sacrifices ('Karma') for one who is incapable of renunciation. To this we reply, by asking whether you do not remember the saying that the opposition between 'jñāna' (spiritual knowledge) and 'Karma' (sacrificial acts) is as unshaken as a mountain. Here also (in this 'Upaniṣad') is mentioned that he who desires to enjoy life, should perform sacrifices, whilst renouncing everything by mantling it over with the idea of God, one should save his soul, and not covet any one's wealth. So does the Law of 'Sannyāsa' (renunciation) teach— "Let him not covet life nor death, let him go to a forest, this is a quarter. "Thence let him not return," this is the commandment of 'Sannyāsa.' The Scripture tells us also concerning the different fruits of these two (action and renunciation).— Thus, in the Taittiriya Upaniṣad, we find "Verily these two Paths are as old as creation, first the Path of Action, secondly the Path of 'Sannyāsa,' the road of resignation, the renunciation of the threefold desires. Of these two, the Path of 'Sannyāsa' is the best. Renunciation verily leads to beatitude." So does Lord Vyāsa the Vedāchārya express it as his well thought out opinion to his son: "There are here two Paths on which the Vedas are based, first, the duty that leads to devotion and action, second, the resignation of action." We shall show later on the various sub-divisions of these two.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

2. Now in this verse the text teaches that the scriptural duties should be necessarily performed in order to obtain purity of mind ('chittam'), 'Kṛtvā,' &c :—Desire thou to live for a hundred years, that is, for the duration of a hundred summers, in this world, always performing sacrificial works like 'Agnihotra,' &c., which are regular works performed without any special desire ('niṣkāma'), and are therefore, causes of liberation. The word 'jīviṣet' is in the third person, but it should be construed in the second in consonance with the foregoing context, or it is probably in the third person as a respectful way of addressing, equivalent to 'Bhavaṁ jīviṣet,' 'may you honor desire to live.' The measure of human life is a hundred years, therefore, the number hundred is employed. It is put in the accusative case because it denotes the duration of time, 'vide Pāṇini' II 3 5. The sense is that one should perform the scriptural duties to the utmost of his abilities, and should never abandon them. For thus says the Lord in the Gītā, "Let thy right be to perform works only, and not to look to their fruits, be not thou a means to the fruition of works (by desiring rewards). let not thy convictions be towards the non-performance of works" (II 47.): so also, "He who performeth works (like a servant) simply to please God, without any attachment to those works

(by the notions that I am the agent, &c.), he is not tainted by works, like a lotus leaf (which remaineth unwetted) in water." (Gîtâ, V. 10).

"Tvayi" is in the locative case in the text, but it is an archaic use, being equivalent to "tava" thy (6th case). The phrase "evam tvayi" is an elliptical sentence. There should be supplied the words 'muktir asti'—"for thee thus performing sacrifices and desiring to live, there is deliverance." The sense is that there is no other method than this by which deliverance can be obtained. As there are various methods of obtaining heaven and the like, so there are not various methods of attainment of deliverance ('mukti'), the means to it is one only. The purport is that salvation is obtained by the purification of the heart, resulting from the performance of works done with the notion that these are all for the sake of the Lord, and are all offered to Him. If it be objected, "how can works lead to 'mukti,' as works must necessarily fructify in some future," we reply, in the words of the verse, 'nâkarmalipyatenare' such works do not taint the soul. That is, works done for the sake of salvation (mukti) will not 'besmear' (lipyati) or bind thee, O man! The sense is that the effects of 'Karma' will not bind thee, even though thou be a man only, when thou performest thy proper duties without any thought of reward but merely worshipping the Lord. Because such works exhaust their force in the act of effecting the purification of the heart, which causeth salvation. For thus it is said "Now these two are the ways on which all the 'Vedas' are based, namely the religion of worldly activity and that of cessation of works."

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

3. (But) those who are (engaged in 'Kâmya' works, and thus are) slayers of Âtmâ (by causing constant rebirths, those ignorant persons) on dying go towards the worlds of the 'Asuras' i.e. (where dwell all selfish worldlyminded souls),—regions covered by the dense darkness (of ignorance).

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

3. Those who kill their 'Âtmâ' by ignoring its existence fall into the round of transmigration, and go to regions covered by the dense darkness of ignorance, and are born as those who do not know the Supreme Self.

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

3. Now this third verse is commenced in order to censure the ignorant. 'Asuryâh' (literally belonging to 'Asuras'), even 'Devas,' &c., are 'Asuras,' so long as they have not realised the state of the Supreme Self, the non-duality. The 'lokâh' or births appertaining to these 'Asûras,' (be they 'Devas' or 'Demons'), is called 'Asuryâh'. The word 'nâm' in the text is an expletive particle. The 'lokâh'—where the fruits of Karmas (merits and demerits) are perceived ('lokyante') or seen or enjoyed is called a 'loka,' i.e., birth. 'Andhena'—by ignorance in which nothing is visible, by darkness. 'Âvrtâ'—covered. Tâṇ—to those births ending with minerals. 'Pretya'—having left this body,

‘Adhigachhanti’ they go. As is said in the following Śruti (Kāth II V. 7.) “some enter the womb again after death for assuming a body, others go inside a trunk according to their deeds and according to their faiths” ‘Ye Ke Atmahanah’ :—who kills the Self is called ‘Ātmahanah’ : Who are such persons? Those who are ignorant. How? They always ignore their Self, because they deny the Self which is ever-existing, owing to their guilt of Ignorance. The common or ignorant people are called killers of Self; for to them the effects and attributes of ever-existing ‘Ātmā,’ such as the consciousness of non-decayingness, immortality, &c., are already non-existing or dead. Therefore, owing to the sin of killing the Self, are they reborn in the world.

ANANTA’S COMMENTARY.

3. Now in the third verse, the Śruti censures those persons who are addicted to the performance of sacrificial works with special motives, such as obtaining a son, wealth, heaven, &c. “Asuryā, &c.”—those persons who are killers of Self (‘Ātmahanah’), who kill their ‘Ātmā’ by putting it in relation to the chain of transmigration, thus causing continual births and deaths, who are not wise, who are addicted to Kāmya works and hence are murderers of their true Self,—such on dying (‘pretya’), go to those regions (‘te lokān’). The word ‘abhi’ in ‘abhigachchhanti’ has the force of ‘direction’ Such persons go towards those regions. What are they? The regions appertaining to the ‘Asuras’ (‘asuryah-asurānām ime’) Those who delight (‘amante’) only in physical life (‘asu’), viz., those who are devoted to the nourishing of their lives merely, the ignorant, addicted to sensual pleasures, are called ‘asurās’ “life enjoyers” What sort of those ‘asurya’ regions They are covered (‘āvritāh’) with blinding darkness, that is, dense ignorance. The sense is that such persons, on account of the preponderance of ignorance, and not knowing the Self, take birth and die again and again. The Lord has said in the ‘Gītā’ (II. 51) :—

“The wise renouncing the fruits born of work, being filled with the true notion of the identity of all, becoming free from the bonds represented by births and deaths, even while alive, reach the immutable state” So also (XVI. 16) “Minds confused by many false allurements surrounded by the snare of delusion, absorbed in the enjoyment of lusts, they fall into unholy hells” Therefore, worshiping God by the performance of duties ordained for one’s particular caste (‘varṇa’) and state (‘āśrama’), with proper rites, and being purified of internal sins through His grace, he will get ‘vaiśya’ (dispassion), and will know the Self, and thus will become liberated. This is the sense of this precept. Thus the following ‘Śruti’ also show that the knowledge of ‘Brahman’ is the only way to liberation: “The knower of ‘Brahman’ attains the Supreme.” “Knowing Him thus, one becomes immortal even here; there exists no other for this” “Thus thy liberation is assured, there is no other way,” &c. What the nature of that ‘Brahman’ is, is explained in the next verse.

ŚANKARA’S RENDERING.

4. The ‘Ātmā’ is changeless, motionless and one (in its absolute state, but in the sphere of relativity) it is swifter than the

mind, the senses cannot grasp it, (it eludes their pursuit) and it goes in advance of them; these senses may run fast, it outstrips them, itself all the while remaining motionless. Being the primeval Force, it sustains all the functions of nature ('animate and inanimate').

ANANTA S RENDERING.

4. God is fearless and one, there is none equal or greater than He, and He is the one inner consciousness of all, He is swifter than mind since mind cannot comprehend Him; Gods like Brahmā, &c., do not know Him completely, He is the cause of the Universe; He is knowledge. He, like the mind, outruns all others. He is inconceivable. Remaining in Him and supported by Him, the 'Vayu' maintains all works; He is the life of the Life Force.

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

4. As on account of killing the Ātmā the ignorant fall into rebirths, so on the contrary, (by the preserving of the same), the wise get salvation, and they are not killers of Self. What the nature of that Ātmā or Self is, is now described in this verse. 'Anejat na-ejat' The term 'ejat' (participial noun) comes from the root, 'ejr' 'to shake.' Shaking is motion, or change of one's own state. That which is devoid of such shaking, which always retains one's form, is said to be 'anejat' or unshaking. That is also 'ekam,' or one among all creatures. It is 'yaviyah' or swifter than 'manas' or mind which has the attributes of doubt. How are those two opposite attributes predicable of the same thing? For in one place you say it is fixed and immovable, then you say it is swifter than 'manas' There is nothing wrong in it.

These opposite attributes are to be adjusted by applying them to the 'Ātmā' in its two different aspects—absolute ('nirupādhi') and conditioned ('upādhi') When viewed in its absolute unconditioned form of Pure Self, it is said to be unmoving and one ('anejat-ekam') The swiftness of the mind is well-known to men, as mind ('manas') or 'antahkarna' (or internal organ) having the attributes of imagination (or will) and doubt, because it is joined to condition or 'upādhi,' even while dwelling here in the body, can go in imagination to distant regions like the 'Brahma loka' in the space of a second. In spite of the mind going to 'Brahma lokas' so swiftly, yet the spiritual consciousness is already there, as they are the reflections of self-consciousness and are included in it, hence Ātmā is swifter than mind. Nainad devāḥ:—the senses like the 'eyes,' &c., are called 'devā' as they illumine ('dyotanāt') the mind. The senses did not attain ('āpnuvan') the truth about Self as described above. The mind is swifter than these (senses), because mental operations precede all sensations. Even a dim reflection of the Self never becomes an object of perception to the senses. Because of this swiftness, it has gone ('arṣat') in advance even of the mind because it is all-pervading like space. That 'Ātmā' is all-pervading and devoid of all the qualities of the world, and by its own absoluteness, by its own form which is without action, it appears as if it has conditioned all the

modifications of the world, as seen by indiscriminating, dull persons ; and being one, it appears as if it is reflected in each body.

Therefore, it is said : 'taddhāvataḥ'—it runs fast, 'anyān,'—other than itself, viz., mind, speech, senses, &c ; atyeti—it goes, as if, beyond these (it runs past them or surpasses them). The idea that motion is an appearance, not a reality, is shown further on by the text itself 'Tisthat' itself verily remaining stationary ; and without action, 'tasmin'—in it, i.e., in this 'Ātmā,' in this Ever—Intelligent. 'Mātariśvā'—that which moves ('śvayati') :—in the firmament ('mātari') namely 'Vāyn' the sustainer of all life, the source of all activity in whom are contained as prodoms all these effects and causes, (or means) like warp and woof, that which is called 'Sūtrātma' (The Thread Soul), who is the Regulator of the whole universe. He is 'mātariśvā' : 'āpah' means acts, or the functioning of all living beings, as well as the acts of illumining, heating, burning, raining, &c., of fire, sun, clouds, &c : 'dadhāti'—supports or regulates. Thus other Śrntis teach the same thing as, "through fear of this 'Ātmā' the wind blows," The meaning is that all changes of causes and effects take place in the substratum of all, the Ever—Intelligent Self.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

4. 'Anejat,' &c. The 'metre' of this verse is Tristup; 'anejat' comes from the root 'ejri' to 'shake' (bhvādi) ; that which does not shake is called 'anejat'—unshaking, i.e., fearless. Some translate 'anejat' as equivalent to 'achalat' 'non-moving' but by this construction, the subsequent line "it is swifter than mind," will contradict it. Moreover, 'fearless' is the proper translation, as another text says, 'Brahman' is undecaying, immortal, and free from fear 'Ēkam' :—one, having no one equal to Him, or above Him. For says the Śruti in 'Śvetāśvatara' &c. :—"Thero is not seen anything that is either equal to Him or above Him." Or He is one by being the Inmost Soul of all, and hence called 'vijñāna-ghana'—consciousness as if solidified—that is all sentience. For says the Śruti :—"One God hidden in all creatures, all-pervading, the inner soul of all beings" ; Manaso javiya :—mind is known to be swift : He is swifter than mind even. He who has swiftness is called 'java-vaḥ' : he who has a greater swiftness is called 'javiyaḥ' : the affix 'vat' ('matup') is elided when the comparative affix ऋतु is added (see 'Pāṇini' V. 3. 65). The swiftness of the mind is seen from the fact that, remaining in the body, it can travel in imagination to the remotest region of the 'Brahma loka.' Brahman is proved swifter than mind, because mind even cannot reach it. Moreover, Gods like 'Brahmā' and the like did not reach this 'Brahman,' i.e., they did not completely comprehend the nature of 'Brahman.' According to some, the word 'deva' means the senses ; it being derived from 'dyotmān,' that which illumines. The senses like the eyes, &c., do not reach Him, that is, cannot make him manifest. This explanation (is useless, as it) is contained in the saying that mind even cannot reach Him : (when mind, the synthesis of all the senses, cannot reach Him, it follows as a necessary corollary that other senses also cannot reach Him). 'Pūrvam'—He is the First, being the cause of the whole universe. As the 'Śrnti' declares : "From whom all these creatures are born, &c." 'Arṣat' comes from the root 'riṣ' 'to go,' ('gati' in

Sanskrit means knowledge also), therefore, it means, knowledge. Thus declares the 'Śruti':—'Brahman' is Truth, knowledge and infinity. The text further declares another transcendental attribute of 'Brahman', opposed to ordinary experience, 'tiṣṭhat,' &c. Remaining stationary ('tiṣṭhati') in its own place, it runs ('dhāvatah') goes quickly, because it is all-pervading, and having outrun ('atitya') or surpassed the others ('anyān'), namely the mind and the like, it is still stationary. In other words, its powers are inconceivable. Further 'mātarīṣva' or 'vāyu' 'the force currents,' so called because they grow or move about ('śvayati') in the firmament ('mātri'—the mother space). 'Śvayati' comes from the root 'tu-o-śvi' ('bhvādi') to grow, to go. In that 'Brahman,' the 'Vāyu' sustains ('dadhāti') all works ('āpah') 'Āpah,' literally 'water,' is a name for works produced from cause and effect, these are contained like the warp and woof of a cloth in 'vāyu,' hence called also the 'Sūtra'—the thread; who is the director of the whole universe, who sustains all life, who is the motive power of all. That 'Vāyu,' the cosmic energy producing activity in all living beings, does so because it has, for its substratum, the 'Brahman.' In other words 'Vāyu,' which is the Life of all, is itself vivified by that 'Brahman.' For thus says the 'Śruti,' "through His fear blows the 'Vāyu,' &c." Or the meaning may be that 'āpah' means that by which are contained ('āpyante') pleasures and pains, through works. It is derived from the root 'āpnoti' by adding the affix 'kvp,' before which the long ऋ is shortened. In Hīn ('Brahman') are placed ('dadhati') by 'mātarīṣva' or 'Vāyu,' all works like sacrifices, fire offerings &c. That is, the works of all creatures are consigned to 'Brahman' or stored up in it. Thus by the following 'mantra,' of the 'Yajñ Veda':—'Devā gātu vido gātum vitva gātumita manaspata imam,' all works are primarily consigned to 'Vāyu' or 'cosmic' energy in its differentiated and homogenous forms: and he 'Vāyu' in its turn consigns all those works to 'Brahman'; therefore 'Brahman' is the supreme substratum of all works like sacrifices, fire-offerings, &c.

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

5. It moves (i. e. appears to do so), it does not move (as a matter of fact), it is far off (i. e. to those who are ignorant), and it is also near, (i. e. to the wise), it is inside of all, and it is outside of all, (i. e. all pervading).

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

5 He shakes the guilty, He gives peace to the virtuous, He is far away from the unwise, He is near to the wise, He is inside of all this world, and He is even outside of it. Or God, as manifested in nature, moves, as all animate creation; yet He does not move, being mountains and hills, He is far away, as sun and stars, He is near, as the earth, He is within all, as the 'antaryāmin,' He is outside of all, as 'Akāśa.'

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

5. "There is no tautology in the sacred hymns", being a well-known maxim, the sense of the above verse is again repeated in this verse. 'Tadejati'

—that Self, Ātmā, which has been described above, ejati, moves, tad—and that verily, 'naijati,' does not move from itself, the sense being, itself immovable, it appears as if it moves. Moreover, 'taddûre,' it is far away, it is as if far away, because it cannot be approached even in hundreds of millions of years by the unwise 'Tadvantike' (this word is composed of three words) 'tad u antike'—it is verily near, not only is it far away, but it is near, because it is the ultimate Self of the wise (nearest and dearest to them) 'tadantarasya sarvasya,' it is the inmost of all these. As another 'Śruti' says: "That 'Ātmā' which is in the interior of all" "Of all this—" of all this universe having name, form and activity, 'Tad u'—that even is outside ('vāhyatah') of all this universe on account of its all-pervadingness like space; being extremely subtle, it is in all. ["On account of its pervadingness, it is outside of all, and owing to extreme subtlety it is inside of all, then it cannot be always one unchangeable essence—" to remove this doubt, the commentator says,] it is always constant, because another 'Śruti' teaches, "It is as if a solid mass of consciousness with no room inside or outside."

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

5. These mysteries are not grasped by the mind by being told once only; therefore the purport of the last verse is again repeated in this 'mantra,' 'Tad,' &c. The 'metre' is 'Anuṣṭup.' That above described 'Ātmā' moves or shakes, and does not move or shake. By itself it does not fear, because it is fearless; but owing to dullness of vision, it appears as if it shakes with fear. Or the verb 'ejati' may be taken in its causative sense, equal to 'ejayati.' He shakes the evil-doers with fear, and so also he does not shake the doers of good deeds with fear. For thus says the 'Gītā' (III. 8). "To save the good, to destroy the evil-doers, to establish religion, I become manifest in various ages." Moreover, he is far off in a distant region, and he verily is near, because he is all-pervading. Or he is far away, because the unwise do not reach him even in tens of millions of years, and thus he appears as if he is far away. He is near, because by being reflected in the hearts of the wise, he is as if he was near. He is not only far and near, but He is even within all this universe consisting of name, form and action. and He is even outside of all this, because he is all-pervading like space ('Ākāśa' or ether). For, says the 'Śruti'—"The God stands pervading all inside and outside."

Or this verse is capable of another interpretation. In the previous verse, 'Brahman' was described as cause, in this the same is described in its effects. Thus that 'Ātmā' moves, *i. e.*, whilst existing in the form of living creatures, it moves. It also does not move, whilst existing in the form of inert matter. It is far off, as existing in the form of suns and stars. It is verily near, as remaining in the form of earth, &c. He is within all this animate creation in the form of the innercontroller. For thus says the 'Śruti': "He who dwelling in Intellect, ('vijñāna') is within Intellect, whom Intellect does not know, whose body is Intellect, who from within rules Intellect, is thy Soul, the Inner Ruler, the Immortal" (B₁. A. V. 7. 22). He is outside of all this universe, because he exists in the form of Time. As says the 'Śruti':—"The 'Puruṣa' in the form of all-devouring Time exists in and out of all." The sense is that all the infinite

animate, and inanimate creation is 'Brahman' only. "A person who worships this does not, after death, proceed by the path of light, &c, as the others do: because he even here has obtained 'Brahman,' he attains 'Brahman,'" &c. say the 'Śrntis.' 'Tadvantike' is compound of 'Tad + u + antike.' The u is 'aprikta,' and ought not to be compounded according to 'Pāṇini,' but the composition takes place by the rules of 'Prātisākhya.'

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

6. He who beholds all beings (from the most subtle unmanifest down to the grossest inert matter) in the Âtmâ ' (as not being separate from the Âtmâ) and (who beholds) the ' Âtmâ to be in them all, despiseth naught because he so beholdeth).

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

6. He who knows that all beings exist in God only, and who beholds the God in all beings, does not go to disgusting states, but becomes liberated.

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

6. The ascetic or one anxious after emancipation who sees ('paśyati') all objects ('sarvabhûta') beginning with the unmanifested 'mûlaprakṛiti' called avyakta and ending with the grossest minerals, in his Self only ('âtmanyeva') that is, does not see anything else than his Self, and who sees in all those objects his own Self ('sarvebhûteṣu châtmanâm') his Self being the Self of those objects by its Self-hood; thinking thus:—"as of this body composed of causes and effects, I alone am the witness and cogniser of all perceptions, though I am pure and without any attributes, so in this very way by myself I am the Self of all creation beginning with 'avyakta' unmanifest, and ending with the minerals"—he who perceives without any distinctions the Self in all objects, by that ('tatah') very realisation or perception, does not despise ('vijugupsate') any body. This ('the statement that he does not despise anybody') is merely explanatory ('prâpta anuvâda') as necessarily following from the foregoing statements. Because all hatred and contempt arise from the false perception of a thing as separate from Self, but when one sees always the pure Self, for him there exist no other objects which can cause contempt. Thus the non-hating becomes a necessary corollary of the foregoing propositions.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

6 The 'Śruti' now tells the mode of worship 'Yastu,' &c. The 'metre of this verse is 'Anuṣṭup.' That person (the above described 'adhikâri') who sees all creatures, beginning from the unmanifested 'mûlaprakṛiti' down to inert matter, all animate and inanimate creation, in the Self (the sign of the locative case is dropped in आत्मन्नेव, which is equal to आत्मन्नेव); i. e., who knows that all creation subsists in 'Brahman' alone, and who again sees the Self in all creation: such a person by reason of his so seeing, does not obtain the disgusting state ('vijugupsate jugupsâm âpnoti'). That is, he becomes liberated. 'Jugupsâ' is synonymous with 'censure,' 'blame,' 'disgust,' 'reproach' and 'ignominy.' It is formed by adding the desiderative

affix 'san' to the root 'gup' by III. 1. 5. ('Pāṇini'): the sense of the root not being changed by such affix. This 'mantra' has the same sense as that conveyed by the following teaching of 'Śrī Kṛṣṇa':—"He who sees me in all and sees all things in me, I shall not destroy him (i. e., I shall not be absent from him), nor shall he destroy me (i. e., he shall never be out of my sight), 'Gītā' VI. 30."

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING

7. When a man so beholdeth and perceiveth that all beings are no other than the Self, and realiseth the unity, where is delusion, and where is grief?

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

7. In that state when a person knows that God is One existing in all beings, and when all beings become as if the 'Ātmā,' in that state beholding the unity of the Ātmā, for him there is no sorrow or delusion, (the chains of 'avidyā' are cut asunder).

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

7. That very purport is taught by the present verse number 7, beginning with 'yasmin,' &c. At what time or in what Self as described above (for the word 'yasmin,' meaning 'in which,' may refer both to soul and time) all these objects ('sarvāṇi bhūtāni') become as 'Ātmā' only ('Ātmane bhūt'); owing to the realisation or perception of 'Ātmā' which is the 'summum bonum' the Great End, owing to the full knowledge (vijānataḥ) that the 'Ātmā' alone is the highest object: then (tatra), i. e., at that time, or in that 'Ātmā,' where is delusion and where is sorrow ('Kamohaḥ, Kahi Śoka')? [Because sorrow arises from not knowing the 'Ātmā' which is extreme bliss 'per se,' and consequently untouched by sorrow. It is owing to this ignorance that one says Oh! I am killed; Oh! I have no sons! Oh! I have no fields! This is, therefore, why he desires to have sons, &c, and in order to have such acquisitions he is anxious to propitiate the gods, not seeing that 'Ātmā' is unity. Therefore by the process of 'anvaya' and 'vyatireka,' realising that sorrow, &c., are the effects of ignorance, when this Primordial Innate Ignorance is removed, there results the complete cessation of all sorrow, &c; therefore the text teaches that it is right knowledge which conduces to cessation of sorrow. In the Suṣupti state of dreamless sleep, though there is cessation of sorrow, yet the root of sorrow still remains, it being merely a 'laya' state. Therefore the commentator says:] Sorrow and delusion arise from the ignorance of the seed of desire and action. For when one sees the Self as unity, as perfectly pure, like the all embracing sky, where can sorrow or delusion be? The sentence is put in the interrogative form for emphasis, meaning that sorrow and delusion being the result of ignorance become impossible when true knowledge arises. This verse shows the complete cessation of all the attractions of the world, with its cause, once knowledge is acquired.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

7. The very same fact is taught by this verse also. 'yasmin,' &c. Its 'metre' is 'Anu-stup.' In that particular state of mind of one who has realised

that all creatures are in the 'Ātmā,' and that 'Ātmā' is in all creatures, ('vijānatah') all creatures become as if the very 'Ātmā' itself. This realisation takes place by constantly thinking over the sense of 'Vedic' texts like these :—" All this is verily 'Brahman,'" &c. That is to say one gets the knowledge that the 'Ātmā' is verily one only which dwells in all creatures. Thus the Lord has said in the 'Gītā' (VI. 31.) "He who realises firmly the unity that dwelleth in all creatures, *viz.*, Me, though he may be in various forms outwardly, he is really always in Me." In that particular state ('tatra') having seen the unity of the 'Ātmā,' what delusion or sorrow can there be for him? The sense is that there is then the complete eradication of worldly transformation together with its cause, because of the absolute impossibility of the existence of grief and delusion, which are the effects of ignorance, for such a mind. As says the 'Śruti (Māndukya' II. 2 8 'Katha' VI. 5).—"The bond of the heart is broken, all doubts disappear, and his works cease to bear fruit, when the Being who is supreme and not supreme is seen."

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

8. It (the 'Ātmā'), like space, surrounds all, is luminous, is not the subtle body; it is not also the gross body, and is consequently without wounds and without muscles, (it is not the causal body and hence) pure (from the taint of ignorance), it is untouched by the sins of virtue and vice; it is all-seeing, it is the Ruler of the mind, it is above all, it is itself all, that eternally free God through his omniscience has allotted from eternal years to all things their respective works according to their nature.

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

8. Such a knower of Self obtains God who is virgin white, *i.e.*, all knowledge and bliss, who is without body, therefore without wounds and fractures being all whole, who is without muscles, who is pure (unimpaired by 'Satva,' 'Rajas,' and 'Tamas'), and who is untouched by sin. The God is all-wise, omniscient, subjugator of all, self-existent, independent of others, He in eternal years has distributed all proper and true objects.

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

8 This verse teaches us what are the specific attributes of the 'Ātmā,' besides those that have been described in the preceding verses 'Sa paryagāt,' that (*sa*) already mentioned 'Ātmā' is all-pervading like space ('paryagāt=*pari*' 'on every side,' 'agāt' "gone", therefore, all-pervading). 'Sukram' means pure, full of light, effulgent. 'Akāyam' means without body, *i.e.*, not having the subtle body called the 'linga śarīra' 'Avramam' means without wounds or boils. 'Asnāvīram'—that in which there are not tendons ('snāva'), or muscles. By the words 'invulnerable' ('aviyam') and without muscles ('asnāvīram') is excluded the gross body, (*i.e.*, the 'Ātmā' is not the gross body called 'sthūla śarīra'). 'Suddham'—pure, without any dross, free from the dross of Ignorance—this

precludes the causal body 'kāraṇa śarīra' also with reference to 'Ātma.' 'Apāpa-viddham' : free from all sins in the shape of duty or virtue ('dharma'), and non-duty or vice, ('adharma') The words 'śukram,' &c., though in the neuter gender in the text, should be understood, however, to be masculine : because the verse begins with 'sa prayagāt' in the masculine, and ends with words like 'kaviḥ,' &c., in the masculine, all referring to the same person. 'Kaviḥ'-seeing on all sides, seeing all, 'all wisē.' As another Śruti says, "There is no other seer than he." 'Maniṣi' means the ruler ('Īstā') of the mind ('manas'), omniscient, the Lord. Paribhūḥ : who is ('bhavati') above ('pari') all beings. 'Svayambhūḥ'—who is ('bhavati') Himself ('svayam') alone, those above whom he is, and that which is above—all that is only himself—therefore he is called 'svayambhūḥ' He, the Ever-free Lord on account of His omniscience has ordained ('vyadadhāt'), has distributed all things ('arthān'), i.e., necessary objects, according to their nature, according as they are fruits of acts or means of performing acts. The word yāthātathyataḥ is an abstract noun in the ablative, derived from the word 'yathā-tathā,' meaning 'as that'; 'Śāśvatibhyah—from everlasting ; 'Samābhyah, the years ; known as 'prajāpatis' or Lords of creatures.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

8. This verse tells us what the fruit is which such a Knower of 'Brahman' obtains, 'Sa paryagat,' &c. The metre is 'jāgāti.' The 'adhikāri' who sees the spirit ('Ātmā') in the mode mentioned above, obtains or reaches that 'Ātmā,' as described below. The word 'paryagāt' is composed of the preposition 'pari' and the verb 'agāt' in the aorist, and means 'prāpnoti,' 'obtains.' In 'Vedio' literature, the aorist conveys sometimes the sense of the present tense, see 'Pāṇini,' III. 4. 6. Of what sort is that 'Ātmā' ? It is white, i.e., pure ('śukra-śukla,' the *ra* being interchangeable with *la*), i.e., its nature is knowledge and bliss. It is without body, i.e., it has no body to suffer or enjoy the consequences of works. Being without body, it is consequently without holes ('avranam'), i.e., it is full without any fractures. It is 'asnāvira,' that is, it has no 'snāvē' or 'muscles. By saying 'akāya,' "without body," the subtle body is negatived with regard to the spirit, and by saying 'asnāvira,' without muscles, the 'gross' body is negatived, as muscles are representative of the 'gross' body, consisting of several humours : thus there is no tautology. The 'Śruti' then describes certain epithets, showing the reason why it is without 'gross' and subtle bodies. 'Suddham' :—pure, not affected by the three qualities of 'satva,' 'rajas' and 'tamas.' The same idea is further expressed by the epithet 'apāpa-viddham' : that which is not touched ('viddham') by sins ('pāpa'), such as pain and the sufferings produced by deeds. The construction is that the wise man obtains ('paryagāt') the above described 'Ātmā,' having the attributes of purity, &c. The Supreme Spirit, though devoid of all actions, yet creates the whole universe, preserves it, &c., by Its inconceivable power. Therefore the text says 'Kaviḥ,' &c. The spirit whom the wise reach ; that spirit, 'Śāśvatibhyah samābhyah'—in eternal years (the ablative here is equivalent to the locative case)—distributes ('vyadadhāt=vi-dadhati, Pāṇini.' III. 4. 6.), according to their true nature ('yathā yathārthya rupenā'), all objects ('padārthān').

Of what sort is that spirit? It is Kaviḥ, wise, all-seeing, omniscient, 'maṇṣi,' intelligent, all knowledge, 'paribhūḥ,' ruler of all, controller of all, 'svayambhūḥ,' independent, absolute, who exists ('bhavati') without wanting any thing from another and by himself alone. Some commentators explain 'Kaviḥ,' &c., as an attribute of the worshipper. They say that the worshipper, by attaining the spirit, becomes 'Kaviḥ,' all-wise, &c. This interpretation should be rejected, as by so doing the continuity of the sentence is broken.

Now the Śruti addresses those who, not knowing the Ātmā by the methods laid down above, are absorbed in works, and who wish to live by merely performing sacrificial works and nothing else.

SĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

9 Those who are engaged in the blind performance of sacrificial works only (without a knowledge of the real nature of deities worshipped) go to regions of blind darkness; and to a still greater darkness than that, they go who are engaged in the knowledge of deities alone.

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

9. Those persons who are devoted to mere sacrificial works go to blind darkness, *i.e.*, are being born and reborn and to a still greater darkness they go who are solely devoted to spiritual knowledge, having abandoned works ordained by scriptures; for their minds never get purified owing to the absence of works.

Those who are devoted to false knowledge about God go to dark regions, but to a greater darkness they go who are selfishly devoted to the true knowledge of God, and do not put right those, who having false notions, are going wrong way.

SĀṆKAR'S COMMENTARY.

9. Here, through the medium of the first verse, is taught the devotion to knowledge ('jñāna-niṣṭhā') by the renunciation of all desires, and this is the sense of the hymn "whatever exists in this world is to be enveloped by the thought of God, and covet not any one's riches." For those ignorant persons who wish for life (and its pleasures), and are incapable of devotion to knowledge, there is taught, by the second verse, the devotion to sacrificial acts, ('Karma-niṣṭhā') by saying "Performing sacred works, let a man desire to live a hundred 'years.'" The division of devotions into these two kinds, as shown in the above verses, is also shown in the *Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, as "He desired, let there be a wife to me, &c." "For an ignorant person who has desire, the sacrifices are ordained, &c." "Mind is his soul and speech his wife," &c., (*Br. A. I. 4. 16*). These verses conclusively establish that ignorance and possession of desires are the necessary qualification of a person devoted to sacrificial works, (*Karma-niṣṭhā*). So also is the result of desire shown there in Chapter I. 51. as the evolution of seven sorts of conditions in which the soul dwells by identifying itself with them

Similarly, it is also shown that by renouncing the threefold desires of wife, &c., the knowers of Self, by opposing the tendency of absorption in action, are established in the Self : as the verse says, "What shall I do with children, &c." They who are devoted to knowledge ('jñāna-niṣṭhā'), who are 'sannyāsins,' are taught the evil consequences of ignorance and ignorant men, by the verses 'To the godless Āsuric regions, &c.'; and they are also instructed in the true nature of the Self by the verse, "He is brilliant, all-pervading, &c." The above verses are addressed to those persons only, and they are fit to receive the instruction contained therein, and not to those who have desires. So says also the 21st verse of the last Chapter of the 'Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad' "Atyaśrami-bhya," &c., which means that instructions contained therein are not addressed to persons having desires. To those who are engaged in works, and devoted to works, and who desire to live by performing works, are addressed the following verses : Andhantamah, &c.

How again is this known that these verses 'Andhantamah,' &c., are addressed only to Karma-kāndins and not to all? Because for those who have no desires, a different end and a different means of accomplishing it have been laid down; and this is a refutation of the charge implied by the above question, as is shown in the foregoing verse—"when a man knows that all beings are even in soul, when he beholds the unity, then there is no delusion, no grief." There is no wise man who ever wishes to conjoin the knowledge of the unity of Ātmā with sacrificial works, or with inferior knowledge, or with anything other than knowledge. Those who wish to make such a conjunction, are the ignorant who are censured here. Herein is taught the conjunction of those things, only, the combination of which is possible either logically or through the authority of Scriptures, (and the Ātma Jñāna and works can never be so combined.) That which is called 'Daivam—vittam,' divine wealth, i.e., the knowledge about things divine, or appertaining to the Gods, is the meaning conveyed here by the word 'Vidyā,' because there is the relationship of such knowledge to sacrificial acts and no 'Brahma-Jñāna' or the knowledge of the Supreme, for such knowledge has no relationship to 'Karma.' Moreover, the different fruit of Deva knowledge is declared in text, "By (the lower) knowledge one attains to the region of Gods. 'Deva—loka'." In the following verse, censure is passed when a person devotes himself exclusively to one of these two, i.e., inferior knowledge or sacrifices separately, in order that one person should practise both concurrently; and not that the sacrificial works or lower knowledge is reproachable *per se*; because the verses show later on the different fruits of each. Thus the text says, "By knowledge they reach to that state. By knowledge they attain to Devaloka. From that region one does not come back. By works one attains to the region of the Fathers." So that nothing ordained by Scriptures should be left unperformed, and thus Śāstric injunctions do not become futile.

There "they enter into gloomy darkness," viz: darkness in which nothing is visible. Who enter? Those who are devoted to 'Avidyā,' viz: that which is not 'Vidyā,' i.e., sacrificial works. Because work is opposed to knowledge. "Those who worship" (upāsate), viz: who being intensely absorbed therein

perform merely the 'Agnihotra' and the like, called herein 'Avidyâ.' Tatah—from that blind darkness, bhûya-iva:—to even greater, to tamah—darkness they enter. Who enter? Who having abandoned works are 'devoted' to or absorbed in knowledge (Vidyâ), viz, in the inferior knowledge of the Gods.

The separate and different fruits produced by knowledge and works have been taught in order that both should be combined. These two do not stand to each other in the relation of principal and subordinate; for a subordinate act is never capable of producing independently any fruit. In other words, if the conjunction was not meant, then the juxtaposition of two things, one producing fruit and the other not producing any fruit, would establish between them the relation of principal and subordinate, which is not meant: the text proves the co-ordination of Karma and inferior 'Vidyâ,' the end being the conjoint effect of both.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

9. 'Andhantamah,' &c. The following six verses have the 'Anuṣṭup metre. Desirous of teaching that knowledge and works should be harmoniously combined in one person, the Śruti censures the exclusive devotion to each, i. e.—those persons who worship (upâste), who perform only Avidyâ, namely, that which is other than Vidyâ, i. e., works: that is to say, who perform sacrifice only for the sake of obtaining heaven, &c. In the word 'Avidyâ,' the negative particle *av* has the force of indicating something other than the thing signified by the word to which it is added, like 'abrâhmaṇa'—a person other than a 'Brâhmaṇa,' i. e., a 'Kṣatriya,' &c. Such beings enter ('praviṣanti') into blinding ('andham') in which nothing can be seen but darkness, ('tamas'), namely ignorance. In other words, they experience the recurrence of worldly transmigrations. 'Tatah'—than that, than that blinding darkness represented by transmigration, 'bhûyah iva' ('iva' here is equal to 'eva'), to a greater darkness even, they enter, who again ('punah') are engaged only in 'Vidyâ,' i. e., in the study of 'Âtmâ' or the knowledge of the deities. The sense is that such persons by having abandoned sacred works, and incurring the guilt of the non-performance of the duties enjoined by the 'Śâstras,' do not get their hearts purified (which such works only can accomplish), and consequently do not obtain knowledge though they may seek it.

Others explain this verse in a different sense. They say this verse establishes the necessity of censuring every false knowledge other than the knowledge of the true nature of 'Âtmâ.' By a false knowledge about Âtmâ, one goes to the regions of the 'Asuras' as taught in verse 3; but by not censuring false knowledge, there is a greater fall than going to the regions of the 'Asuras.' This verse does not censure works, pure and simple, because, in the absence of works, there would necessarily be a want of effort to acquire knowledge (the effort itself being a work), and because of the non-reproach of devotion to mere works. Moreover, the word 'eva' "merely" in verse 2 "performing merely sacred works, let a man desire to live a hundred years," shows that mere works without knowledge are not censurable. Therefore the sense of this verse is, those who are devoted

to 'Avidyā,' i. e., false knowledge about spirit, enter the hell, called 'Andham—tamas' Thus the 'Śruti' says, "Who knoweth the 'Brahman' to be 'asat,' he becomes as if 'asat.'" Similarly, those who are selfishly engaged in the acquisition of the knowledge of the true nature of spirit (Vidyā), and do not censure the false knowledge of spirit, by which people fall into the state of 'Andhamtamaḥ,' fall on this very account into deeper darkness than that in which those enter who have not the true knowledge of spirit.

(In other words, this explanation shows that selfish seekers of spiritual knowledge miss their aim. Not only should a man himself acquire spiritual knowledge, but it is his 'duty' to put right those who entertain false notions about spirit.)

SĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

10. They say, the result of a knowledge of the Gods is different (since by it one goes to the region of the Gods), and they say the result of the performance of sacrificial works is different (as it leads to the regions of the Pitris), thus have we heard from the Wise Ones who explained both to us

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

10. The knowers of God say the result of the knowledge of God is different, as it confers immortality, and they say the result of mere works is different as it leads to the worlds of the Fathers, &c, this we have heard from the sages who have explained both to us. By the true knowledge of God, partial emancipation is obtained, and by putting right those who have wrong notions of God, fruit or somewhat like partial liberation, is obtained.

SĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

10. By 'Vidyā' or inferior knowledge a different ('anyat') fruit is produced, for so they say ('āhnh') For the 'Śruti' declares, "by knowledge the world of the Gods; by knowledge they reach there." A different ('anyat') fruit is obtained, they say, by Ignorance, namely, by works. For the Śruti says: 'by works, the world of the Fathers.' Thus ('iti') we have heard ('Śāśrnmah') the speech of sages possessed of wisdom (Dhīrānām): from those teachers who have explained (vichachakṣire) to us ('naḥ') these: namely works and knowledge. That is to say, that is the traditional knowledge handed down from antiquity.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

10. This verse teaches the different fruits of knowledge and mere works, 'Anyat,' &c. The knowers of 'Brahman' say ('āhuh') that the fruit of 'Vidyā' or knowledge of the Self is different, i. e., by such knowledge one obtains Immortality. The learned say that different is the fruit of 'Avidyā,' i. e., different is the fruit obtainable by the performance of mere works, namely, the fruit is the obtainment of the regions of the Fathers, &c. For says the 'Śruti':— 'By works, the world of Fathers, by knowledge the world of 'Devas'

or Gods; the world of Gods is the best amongst all worlds, therefore, they praise knowledge." How is it known that different are the fruits of knowledge and works? The 'Śruti' answers:—Iti &c., we have thus heard the saying of the wise: those teachers who have explained (vyachachaksire) to us this, viz., the different fruits of work and knowledge. That is, this is the traditional knowledge handed down from the past, from teacher to pupil, in unbroken succession.

When 'Avidyā' and 'Vidyā' are taken to mean the false and true knowledge of spirit, the meaning of the verse is this. The ancients say that by 'Vidyā', or the knowledge of the true nature of Self, one fruit is obtained, namely, liberation of a partial kind; and by 'Avidyā' i. e., by censuring false knowledge of another, a different fruit is obtained, i. e., a fruit similar to the fruit of partial liberation. Thus we have heard the wise say who taught us the means of liberation. It follows, therefore, that both should be combined.

ŚAṆKARA'S RENDERING.

11. Who knows that both these sacrificial works and knowledge about the Gods, are to be performed concurrently by one through sacrifices crosses over the effects of natural works, and through knowledge gets partial Immortality by attaining to the condition of a deity.

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

11. He who collectively performs both sacrifices and knowledge, knowing that both are requisite for obtaining the highest end of man, cleanses the impurities of his heart by knowledge, enjoys Immortality, or attains liberation.

ŚAṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

11. Vidyām-cha Avidyām -cha means the inferior knowledge of the God, and sacrifices. He who knows 'both these, i. e., who understands that one should practise both these conjointly, obtains the result hereinafter mentioned, because he combines both towards the accomplishment of one desired object. Such a person, by sacrifices like 'Agnihotra,' &c, called 'Avidyā,' having crossed or overcome 'death' ('mrityuh'), that is to say, having overcome all natural work and knowledge, both being connoted by the term ('mrityuh') by knowledge, i. e., by knowledge of Gods 'enjoys' or attains Immortality, i. e., the idea of one being a Deity. That is called Immortality when one reaches a state in which one feels oneself identical with Divinity.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

11. The 'Śruti' now teaches the conjunction of both, 'Vidyām' &c., 'Vidyā':—the knowledge of 'Ātmā'; 'Avidyā':—work or the ensuing of false knowledge. 'Cha':—is a conjunction, showing the aggregation of both these. 'Tad nḥayam saha':—both these combined, as conducing to the attainment of the final purpose of man 'Yo veda':—who knows that one man singly should perform both these. He through 'Avidyā,' namely, through the performance of 'Agnihotra' sacrifice, &c, with the notion of consigning it all to God, having

crossed ('tīrtvā') death, i. e., the killer, viz., the impurity of the heart ('antah-karṇa'), and having become perfect by the purification of the heart, through Vidyā or the knowledge of Ātmā, attains Immortality and obtains liberation. Amṛita in the text, is the name of a particular state, the state of liberation. As the Lord Kṛiṣṇa has said in the Gītā:—"The state which is obtained through Sāṅkhya, that very state is reached through Yoga also. He who sees Sāṅkhya and Yoga as one, he verily sees." The Sāṅkhya and Yoga here stand for knowledge and work.

SĀṅKARA'S RENDERING.

12. Those who worship the unmanifest nature go to regions of blind darkness: to a greater darkness than that go they who are devoted to the worship of the manifested nature as 'Hiraṇya garbha.'

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

12. Those persons who worship the non-creator, saying that God is not the creator, the world is created, preserved and destroyed by its own inherent nature, or who hold the doctrine that soul is a phenomenon like the intoxicating power of wine and consequently there are no rebirths, enter into groping darkness; and to a greater darkness they go who, without cleansing their hearts by works, and not knowing their impurities, are blindly absorbed in the pursuit of spiritual knowledge.

SĀṅKARA'S COMMENTARY.

12. Now desirous of teaching the collective and conjoint worship of the manifest and the unmanifest, the text censures the exclusive worship of each. They enter into blind darkness who worship Asambhūti. The creation is called 'sambhūti'; that of which the effect is creation is called Sambhūti: that which is not—Sambhūti is called Asambhūti, viz., nature, cause, ignorance, called the unmanifest. Those who worship her, the great unborn, called the unmanifest, the Nature, the Cause, the Ignorance, the Seed of desire, and action, the Invisible, they enter into a gloomy darkness appropriate thereto and into a greater darkness than that enter they who are devoted to God in nature ('Kārya-brahma') called the 'Hiraṇyagarbha.'

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

12. The above mentioned statement is further strengthened by three verses, 12 to 14, 'Andhantamah,' &c. It has already been said that they go to blind darkness who worship 'Avidyā.' Now is explained the nature and form of this 'Avidyā,' by the word Asambhūti, &c. Asambhūti—there is no Sambhūti, i. e., there is no being by whom the world is created, preserved, &c. Asambhūti must have this meaning, as Sambhūti means creator, &c. Those who hold that God is not the agent in the creation, preservation, &c., of the world, but that by its own nature it is produced, preserved and destroyed, those who worship the Ātmā in this way, enter into blind darkness. Because the Śruti says: "From whom all these creatures are produced, by whom being born they live, &c. to whom they go, they enter:" and the above mentioned persons contradict this

Sruti. So has also Lord 'Kṛiṣṇa' said : "The Asuras say the world is untrue, is not governed by laws of virtue and vice, is without any God or Ruler, is produced from the union of atoms (or male and female); and say that nothing else but Desire has caused it. They, holding such opinions based upon gross perception only, are of evil conduct, of small intelligence, of cruel deeds, and born for the destruction of the world. These fools, obtaining the birth of an 'Asura' in each successive incarnation, and not attaining Me, O Son of Kuntī, go consequently to lowest states." (Gītā XVI. 8 9. 20). The rest of the verse is like the previous one. Or the meaning is this. There is no intelligent 'Ātmā' endowed with the qualities of Yama and Niyama, &c. All souls are like bubbles in water. The intelligence is an accidental quality like the intoxicating power produced in wine by fermentation. The 'Bauddhas,' holding such evil doctrines, are being censured by this verse. Those persons who worship 'Asambhūti,' i.e., who hold as a firm 'dogma' that there is no rebirth ('na Sambhūti'), that there is no incarnation of a person once dead, and consequently who hold that on death we become liberated ('mukti') verily, they enter into blind darkness. And similarly those who are devoted to 'Sambhūti,' i.e., the creator, the supreme 'Deva,' who are absorbed in Him, and do not perform works, who, not knowing the impurities of their intellect, are engaged in the pursuit of the knowledge of 'Ātmā' only, i.e., who hold that Ātmā only exists, that there are no such things as works, and that there is no connection between 'Karma-kāṇḍa' and Jñānakāṇḍa; such persons enter into a far ('iva') greater ('bhuya') darkness than blind darkness.

Or the meaning may be this. Desirous of combining the worship of the 'Manifest' and the 'Unmanifest,' this verse censures the exclusive devotion to either alone. Therefore Sambhūti means creation, the production of effect: the opposite of this is 'Asambhūti' or Prakṛiti or the cause called Unmanifest. Those who worship that 'Asambhūti,' called the Unmanifest, the cause, or 'Prakṛiti,' which is the seed of ignorance, desire and work, which is invisible, go to a corresponding blind darkness, i.e., fall into the cycle of births and deaths. And those who worship Sambhūti, the Brahman in its effects like Hiranya-garbha, &c., enter into a far greater darkness than the last.

ŚAṆKARA'S RENDERING.

13. They say the result of the worship of Hiranyagarbha is different (a) by it one attains the psychic powers, called *animā*, &c.) and they say the result of worshipping the Unmanifest is different (since by it one gets prakṛiti-laya or mukti in the shape of absorption in nature). Thus have we heard from the wise ones who have explained both to us

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

13. Different they say is the fruit of worshipping 'Sambhūti,' and different is the fruit of worshipping 'Asambhūti.' This we have heard from the wise who have explained both to us.

ŚAṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

13. The Śruti now mentions the different or partial results of the worship of each separately, thus showing the reason for worshipping them both conjointly. They say ('āhn̄h') the fruit is verily different of worshipping the Brahman in its effects, i.e., they have explained that the fruit of such devotion is the attainment of psychic powers, called 'animā,' &c. So also they say the result is different if one worships the Unmanifest, for the authors of the Purāṇas say that by such worship one enters the state of 'Prakṛiti-laya' or absorption into nature—the state of blind darkness mentioned in the text. Thus have we heard from the sages the different fruits of the worship of Avyākṛita and 'Vyākṛita,' from those who have explained it to us.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

13. Now the 'Śruti' explains the different fruits of each which is the reason why the worship of both should be combined, 'Anyad,' &c. The wise say that the fruits of worshipping 'Sambhūti' or 'Brahman' in nature is different, i.e., one gets thereby the psychic powers like Animā, Laghūmā, &c. Similarly, the fruit of worshipping 'Asambhūti' is said to be different, that is the worship of the Unmanifest leads to blind darkness. For thus sayeth Lord Kṛṣṇa. "Those whose heart is engrossed in the 'Avyakta'—the Unmanifest, suffer many pains" 'Iti,' &c. Thus have we heard of the wise, who have explained to us the difference in the results of the worship of 'Sambhūti and Asambhūti.'

ŚAṆKARA'S RENDERING.

14. Who knows that he should combine in himself the worship of both the Unmanifest which is indestructible, and the Manifest, whose effects are destructible; such a one through the worship of Hiranyagarbha overcomes death, (i.e., all weakness and want of power by acquiring 'Siddhis,') and, through the worship of the Unmanifest, enjoys the partial Immortality of being assimilated to nature.

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

14. The 'Yogī' who knows the supreme God, the creator of all, as well as the destructible physical nature, who knows collectively both this perishable body and the imperishable soul in it; who knows the real and the unreal, he, through his perishable body, by performing with it good acts, purifies his heart, and by the knowledge of God becomes immortal, and gets liberation.

ŚAṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

14. 'Because this is so, therefore it is reasonable that the worship of 'vyākṛita' and 'avyākṛta' should be combined in one person, as then only does it lead to the proper end of man. Therefore, says the text, "He who knows both together the created nature and destruction, &c." "By destruction"—by that whose products have the attribute of being subject to destruction: here by a figure of rhetoric, the attribute stands for the thing possessing the attribute. By the worship of such destruction having crossed over 'death,' viz., imbecility,

and vice produced from sins of lust and the like, he obtains the fruit of possessing psychic power like 'animā' &c., by worshipping 'Hiranyagarbha.' Thus having transcended 'Death' in the shape of want of power, &c., he, by worshipping the Asambhūti or the Unmanifest, enjoys Immortality by being dissolved into nature ('Prakṛiti-laya'). In the text, 'Sambhūtim cha vināśam,' &c., the negative particle \nmid should be supplied, i.e., the text should read thus :—Asambhūtim cha vināśam, &c. Because the fruit 'Asambhūti—mritamaśnute' he attains Immortality through 'Asambhūti,' it shows that vināśa refers to Sambhūti.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY

14 Having shown all this, the 'Sinti' now draws the following conclusion from all that has been taught above Sambhūti,—the Supreme Spirit, the 'Parabrahman,' who is the one sole cause of the production ('sambhava') of the whole universe. Vināśa :—that whose quality is to be destroyed, that which is liable to destruction. It is formed by adding the affix 'ach' (ञ) to the word 'vināśa,' the resultant form being, however, the same (see 'Pāṇini,' V. 2 127.) That is, it means the body that is liable to destruction so also the world. The 'Yogi' who knows ('veda') both together ('śaha'), i.e., having made them both one, namely the soul that dwells in the body and the body, who discriminates between the real and the non-real, who knows "I am separate from the body, the conjunction with body is for the sake of suffering the fruits of works," and who by so knowing, with his body ('vināśena') good, motiveless deeds ('niṣkāma'), which give rise to spiritual knowledge, and ultimately consigns all those deeds to God, such a wise one by the destructible ('vināśena') fragile body, through the performance of pure and good works, having crossed death, i.e., having purified the inner organ by removing its impurities, enjoys immortality through 'Sambhūti' or through the knowledge of 'Ātmā.' He obtains liberation.

On this verse may have this meaning. This verse teaches the concurrent worship of both 'Sambhūti' and 'Asambhūti,' because both go towards the attainment of the particular purpose in view. In this verse the negative particle \nmid has been elided by 'Pāṇini,' VI. 3 109, before the two words 'vināśa' and 'vināśena'; i.e., those words are really 'avināśa' and 'avināśena.' This elision must be inferred as the context requires that 'vināśa' should mean 'Asambhūti,' and therefore should mean 'avināśa,' because 'Asambhūti' is not destructible. He who conjointly worships or knows both the 'Sambhūti' and the 'avināśa,' the Manifest and the Unmanifest; that 'Yogi' by means of the worship of the indestructible, the Unmanifest, having crossed or overcome death, i.e., want of power arising from the guilt of irreligion and lust, enjoys or obtains, through the worship of Sambhūti or Hiranyagarbha, the Immortality of the Prakṛti-laya.

Or Sambhūti may mean Hiranyagarbha and other Gods, because they are existent (sambhavati). By the worship of Sambhūti, namely, Hiranyagarbha and other deities, having crossed death, i.e., having removed the impurity of the inner organ, he enjoys Immortality or liberation (mukti) through the worship of the Indestructible, the Paramātmā, the Supreme Spirit, who is free from

the fault of birth and decay ('vināśa'); that is, by obtaining the knowledge of the Supreme Spirit, one becomes liberated. In this explanation, the order of the words in the text has been reversed, and the text is read 'sambhūta mṛityum tīrtvā avināśena amṛitam aśnute.'

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

15. Thou Nourisher! Open to me, a worshipper of Truth, the door of Truth concealed by the golden disk of the luminous photosphere; so that I may see the Satya-puruṣa dwelling in Thee, O Sun!

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

15. (Having thus fitted himself, by theory and practice, the 'Yogi' prays for the vision of God)—The face of God, the best of Beings, the Imperishable, residing in the orb of the sun, is covered by the luminous sphere that enshrouds the sun O God, O Nourisher of Thy devotees! remove that veil of light, so that I, the worshipper of Truth, may see Thee.

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

The highest result attainable through human objects and celestial knowledge, according to the Scriptures, culminates in absorption into nature ('Prakṛiti-laya'). So far extends the circuit of worldly life, i. e., the sphere of 'Karmic' forces causing transmigration. Beyond that, is the sphere of the renunciation of all desires and devotion to pure knowledge which teaches that all that exists is Self only, as taught in a former verse. Thus two sorts of Vedic teachings have been described here, *vz.* the doctrine of work ('pravṛtti') and the doctrine of renunciation ('nivṛtti'). This two-fold doctrine is taught in other Upaniṣads also. Thus in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, that portion of the 'Brāhmaṇa' which ends with the 'Pravargya' sacrifice is adapted to explain all the rules of positive duty and negative virtues relating to the Vedic doctrine of activity. The other portion of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka is meant to teach the Vedic doctrine of cessation of works. In the text, "he who knows both knowledge and ignorance together, (verse 11)" is taught the knowledge of inferior 'Brahman' appertaining to works, beginning with the ceremonies to be performed at the time of birth and ending with the rites at the funeral pyre, performing which one should desire to live for hundred years. In the above verse it is also said that he enjoys the ambrosia of Immortality through knowledge by crossing over death through non knowledge. Now, in the present verse, is explained the path through which Immortality is to be enjoyed. Thus the 'Bṛhadāraṇyaka' says, (V. 5. 2) :— "That which is truth, that is 'Āditya,' the 'Puruṣa' which is in that luminous orb and the Puruṣa which is in the right eye, both are truth ('Satya')." A worshipper of 'Brahman' who has duly performed all the various works, when the time of death approaches, prays thus to the soul of Truth in order to obtain an entrance for himself into that luminous sphere.

'Hiraṇyamaya'—like as if it was golden and full of light, concealed or covered by such a golden screen, i.e., covered by the photosphere of light, hides the face of truth, i.e., the 'face' or entrance to 'Brahman' residing in the solar orb is enveloped ('āpihiṣam') or closed by this golden screen or photosphere. 'Tattvam':—O Pūṣan remove or open ('āpavṛṇu') Thou that screeneth, for me ('Satyadharmāya') who am a worshipper of Truth by worshipping Thee, O Truth, for Truth is my religion, so that I may see Thee, i.e., approach Thy Soul of Truth. The word satyadharmāya may mean also the establisher of the religion of Truth, in that case the verse should be translated, O Pūṣan open Thou that door so that I may see the establisher of the religion of Truth.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

15. Having, in the preceding verses, taught to the adhikāṣi (disciple) the nature of the Supreme Spirit, in the remaining portion of the book is taught the means of liberation ('mokṣa') which consist in the direct perception of Brahman. The direct perception or God-vision does not take place merely by reading or hearing. Moreover, by mere God-vision there is no 'mokṣa,' it is a means only; the 'mokṣa' is obtained only through the grace of the Lord. For says the 'Śrīti,' ('Kath.' V. 1. 2. 23.) "The 'Ātmā' cannot be gained by knowledge, nor by understanding, nor by manifold works and science. Whom He elects, by him is He gained; for him this Ātmā reveals Its own truth." Therefore a person who has studied the science of Spirit and cogitated over it, should pray to the Spirit for His realisation or vision, and similarly a person who has obtained the vision of Spirit, and has seen Him face to face, should pray to him for obtaining 'mokṣa' or liberation. The remaining verses, Hiraṇya, &c., show the mode in which the Lord should be addressed in prayers. In this hymn, worship in the form of 'Āditya' is taught 'Hiraṇmayeṇa Pātreṇa,' &c.

The metre is 'Anuṣṭup.' That which is like gold is called Hiraṇmaya, that is full of light 'Pātram':—vessel, from the root pā to 'drink,' that in which something put is drunk. that in which the rays abide is also called 'pātra,' i.e., the solar disc or orb. By that luminous orb or photosphere is covered ('āpihiṣam') the face, i.e., the whole body of the Truth, of the glorious God, the Highest Person, the Indestructible, the dweller of the solar orb, the form being assumed as a kind of veil. The face which is so veiled by the curtain of light, O 'Pūṣan' (who feeds 'puṣnāti') O Feeder and Nourisher of Thy devotees 'O Supreme Spirit' do Thou uncover, do Thou unveil! Why? 'satya dharmāya dṛiṣṭaye' He who holds ('dhārayati') or ponders in his heart, over the form consisting of Truth, ('satya') knowledge and bliss, is called 'satyadharmān'. "for the sake of such a person" will he, 'satyadharmāya' (in the dative case), as 'satyadharmasya' The meaning is, "open Thy face for the vision ('dṛiṣṭaye darśanāya),' of Thy devotees like myself who cherish Truth in their hearts" That is, become visible or manifest. The word 'dṛiṣṭaye' is dative singular of 'dṛiṣṭi' which is formed from the root 'dṛiṣ' to 'see,' by the addition of the affix kṛin (क्ति) forming the abstract noun. The ण is changed into ञ by VIII. 2. 36, the ण is changed into ट by Pāṇini, VIII. 4. 41 दृश् + ति = दृश् + क्ति = दृश् + टि. This is the Rṣi's prayer.

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

16. O Nourisher! O the Sole-Mover! O Thou Controller! O Thou Appropriator of all lives and rays! O Thou Child of Prajāpati! disperse Thy rays and lessen Thy heat and light, so that I may see Thy most propitious form. I do not beg this as a servant but as an equal, for the 'Puruṣa' that is there in Thee, that am I.

ANANTA'S RENDERING

16. O Nourisher! O Thou Sole-Knowledge! O Thou Ruler! O known to the wise! O beloved of the Lord of creatures! illumine my rays and expand my knowledge So that I may see, through Thy grace, Thy most auspicious form. The 'Puruṣa' that is in the orb of the sun, and in other forms, verily that am I.

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

16. 'O Pūṣan' :—The sun is so-called because it supports ('posayati') the universe.

'Ekarse':—O One—'Riṣi'—the only One that moves ('rṣati') or goes.

'O Yama'! O Controller! so-called because he controls ('samyamanāt') all the various worlds. 'O Sūrya'! O Attractor!—he is so-called because he withdraws or attracts to himself ('svi-karṇa') all the rays, all the vital forces and fluids

'O Prajāpatya'?—O son of 'Prajāpati' withdraw ('vyah') i.e., withhold all Thy rays ('rasinī'), and diminish ('samūha') i.e., collect together all Thy 'splendour' ('tejas'), i.e., Thy heat and light So that I may see Thy gracious and most auspicious form, Thy most beautiful form Verily, I do not ask this favour from Thee as a beggar or a servant, but of right, because that 'Puruṣa,' which is in Thee, is the same as I. That Being, dwelling in the orb of the Sun, whose limbs consist of the several 'Vyāhritis,' is called 'Puruṣa,' because it has the form of a man; or it is so called because by it in the shape of vital forces, the intellect and Self has filled ('pūrṇa') the whole universe; or it is so-called because it dwells in the body.

('Puri-Sayanāt') 'Sohamasu':—I am verily that, I become verily that.*

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

16. The same thing the 'Riṣi' asks in more explicit terms. 'Pūṣan,' &c. The metre is 'uṣṇik'.

'O Pūṣan'! O Nourisher! 'O Ekarse'! This word is compound of 'Eka' and 'Riṣi,' he who is the one sole 'Riṣi' 'Riṣi' comes from 'Riṣ' 'to know,' O thou the principal Intelligence! 'O Yama'! He who regulates ('yamayati') is called 'Yama': as says the Śūnti. —'He who controls ('yamayati') from within is 'Brahman' &c, O Controller! 'O Sūrya'! He who is knowable by the sages ('Sūri') is called 'Sūrya': it is formed by adding the 'Taddhita' affix 'yat,' to the

* Of this Satya-Puruṣa, the 'Vyāhṛti Bhūh' is the head, 'Bhuvah' are the arms, and 'Swah' are the feet. Ānandagiri.

word 'sūri': the final *r* of which is elided by 'Pāṇini,' VI. 4 48. (सूरि + व = सूर + व). O Thou known only by the wise ! 'O Prājāpatya' ; The Lord (pati) of creatures ('prajā') is called 'Prājāpati.' His other name is Hiranyagarbha (the first emanation of 'Brahmā'). Brahmā is said to be beloved by 'Prājāpati,' because 'Brahmā' first instructed him in 'the 'Vedas,' as says 'Śvetāśvatara':—"He who first created the Hiranyagarbha Brahmā, and taught him all the Vedas."

O Thou beloved of 'Prājāpati'! 'Vyūha raśmin Samūha tejah' : illumining my rays, ('raśmin') expand ('vyūha') all Thy brilliancy, that is to say, expand Thy external appearance and my knowledge. So that I may see ('paśyāmi') through Thy (te) grace, that ('tat') most auspicious form of Thine ('yat terūpam kalyāna tamam') the most propitious form; the 'Smṛiti' says "He is the auspiciousness among all auspiciousnesses" Or this line may mean, 'O Nonrisher,' O One Knower! O Regulator! O known by the sages! O Sun of 'Prājāpati' or 'Dharma,' in the shape of 'Nara'—'Nārāyana'! Disperse ('vyūha') Thy rays which falling on my eyes prevent them seeing Thee and lessen ('samūha') Thy brilliancy ('tejah'), that is, adapt it so that I may be able to see The rest is like the above.

In what way wilt Thou see, is taught in the next line. ya &c. That 'puruṣa' (one who dwells—'sete' in the bodies—'pūrṣa,'—is 'puruṣa'), that being that dwells in the orb of the sun, that 'puruṣa' that dwells in other bodies as well, that 'puruṣa' am I : that is, the being dwelling in the orbs of the sun and other forms is one with the luminous being that is in my heart. The sense being that I see Thy form in this way. The purport being that the means to liberation consist in the consciousness alone of such unity.

The word 'asāvasan' is formed by combining असौ and वसौ. By the rules of grammar, the final *v* ought to have been omitted, but is not, by another rule which says *y* and *v* are not elided when they are final in a 'pada' and occur between two vowels. See 'Pāṇini,' VIII. 3. 19 &c.

ŚĀṆKARA'S RENDERING.

17. Let my 'Līṅga-Śarīra' consisting of seventeen members on leaving this body, go to the 'Sūtrātma,' let my 'Sthūla-Śarīra' be consumed to ashes by fire, Om! O Protector! preserve me! O mind! remember what I ought to remember now, remember what acts I have done in my studentship and family life.

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

17. Now of me dying, let my individual Prāṇa Vāyu resolve itself into the great ocean of Life ; my Līṅga Śarīra, purified by knowledge and works, go out of this body! Let my gross body be reduced to ashes. Om! O my mind, remember that which ought to be remembered at this juncture, remember the various thoughts thought by thee up to this time, and remember all the acts that were done by thee since thy childhood! Remember thy acts, O mind! Remember! Remember all that I have done since my childhood.

ŚĀṆKARA'S COMMENTARY.

17. 'Vāynr anilam amṛtam':—Now of me dying, let the 'vāyn'—'the vital force' or 'Prāṇa,' abandoning this individual body, ('adbyātma'), dissolve itself into the universal body called 'ādhidaivata,' the natural fountain of all life; the great fluid, the great Immortality, the 'Sutrātma' or the cosmic life. The word 'resolve itself or obtain' should be supplied in order to complete the sense. This is a hint showing that the vital airs should go out, being purified by knowledge and work. (The 'Vāyn' of all persons does not mix in the universal reservoir, it is only those who are pure, whose 'Līṅga-Śarīra' undergoes complete disintegration as soon as death ensues.) This is to be inferred from the fact that the person is capable of claiming entrance into the solar region. 'Athedam &c.'—Now may this gross body, being offered as a sacrifice to fire, be resolved into ashes. "Om krato &c." In prayers, 'Om' stands as a symbol for Truth, and is a name of fire, though as a fact 'Brāhman' itself is called 'Om.' 'O krato'!—Oh mind, whose function is willing, remember that which ought to be remembered at this juncture, for, the time has approached very near indeed, so remember all the past deeds done up to this time. O Fire! remember those works which I have done from my childhood upwards. The repetition is for the sake of emphasis.

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

17. "Now of me dying let the vital forces ('vāyu'), leaving this individual body, go to the Universal Body, the Great Life ('Anila')," and for this purpose the Rishi prays as follows:—'Vāyuranilam &c.'

Of the Ineffable word 'Aum,' the stay of the 'Yogis,' the Supreme, the 'Brahman,' called the Glory, having the attributes of non-grossness &c, the seer is 'Brahman,' the metre is 'gāyatrī,' the devatā is the Supreme Spirit, it is the 'Śabda-Brahma' (the Word God), to be uttered in commencing and ending all recitals, and should be employed in sacrifices and burnt offerings, &c., in 'Śānti' and puṣṭik ceremonies and the like. The 'Yogi' reminds his mind by these three words 'Vāyu, anila and aum,' of the sacrifices performed by him. This is the introduction.

O Thou Supreme Spirit! of me dying let the 'Vāyn' (resolve into the universal Vāyn). Here the word Vāyu means the Prāṇa-Vāyu (the vital force), and is taken as a representative of the seventeen inner organs forming the subtle body, (five organs of action, five organs of perception, five vital airs, mind and intellect) May the 'Prāṇa' forming the 'Līṅga-Śarīra,' consisting of the 17 members, renouncing the garb of Individuality, obtain the universal form, the Soul of all, the Immortal, the 'sutrātman,' the Great Life ('Anilam'), the Principal Life. As says the Śruti—"Vāyn" verily exists, 'O Gautama'! by its cords; by the cords of "Vāyn, O Gautama! by its cords, this world and the next world, verily all creation, are supported and strongly bound together." The sense is, let the 'Līṅga-Śarīra,' purified by knowledge and work, go out of the body. Afterwards let this gross body be thrown into the Fire, and let it be reduced to ashes ('Bhagnānta,' that whose 'anta' or end is ashes only), having fulfilled its

mission 'Aum':—is a symbol, it is here the name of Agni, the All-Truth, in no way different from 'Brahman,' 'Om.' O mind ('kratu,' whose function is to will), remember all that I ought to remember, the time for remembering that has arrived, therefore remember thou whatsoever hath been done by me in my studentship and family life. Having done so, remember also, remember, O mind, whatever sacred duty hath been accomplished by me since my infancy up to this time. The repetition is for the sake of respect.

Or, to remove the doubt in which one falls when he actually sees the body being reduced to ashes, and thinks that the body being destroyed, the 'Brahman' that dwelt in it must necessarily be born and die again, the verse may be construed by the sense that though this body may appear to be reduced to ashes, yet the Supreme Spirit, that dwelt in it, is not touched by the fault of birth and death. How do you show this? By reversing the order of words and their sequence and cases in the verse thus: 'anilam—anilah, amritam—amritah.' Since 'anila' the Great Life, and 'Vāyu' the 'Prāṇa' are both immortal, so 'Brahman' is also immortal, what question can there be as to the immortality of 'Brahman'? Thus Its purity from birth and death is established by 'a fortiori' reasoning. If it be doubted how immortality is possible for the worldly 'Vāyu'; since it is merely figurative, then the immortality of God is also of the same nature. To this we reply, that though the body is destroyed, yet the non disappearance of 'Vāyu' is known by its effects. As says the 'Bṛihadāraṇyaka Śruti':—O Gautama! By the cords of 'Vāyu' this world and the next and all the creatures in them are sustained. If the 'Vāyu' does not work, all Gods become confused: the 'Vāyu' is the only deity that never sets or ceases to work."

The sage then prays to 'aum aum'! &c 'O Krato!'- O intelligence, having the qualities of protecting, &c, remember me! Remember the prayers and contemplations &c. performed by me. The repetition is for the sake of distinctness, for Yāska has said that by repetition a particular meaning is brought out. The remembering by the Supreme Spirit is a sign of grace to the devotees. Thou art the means of that. The word "aum" comes from the root ऋ 'to protect.' To the root 'av' is added the affix 'manin' by 'Paṇini' III, 2. 75. Then the final syllable of 'manin' is elided. The changes undergone are represented by the following equation: — ऋ + मन् = अ + मन् = अ + क् + म् (Pāṇini VI. 4. 20.) = ऋक् 'Protector.'

SANKARA'S RENDERING

18. O Agni, lead us by the good path, (the 'Devayāna' path, from which there is no return), so that we may obtain the fruits of actions. O Effulgent Thou knowest all our works and thoughts, Take away and destroy our crooked sins from us! We offer Thee our best salutations: (as we are unable to give Thee anything better)

ANANTA'S RENDERING.

18. O Agni! Guide us by the good path (the Devâyana) that we may obtain the treasure of salvation. Thou knowest all our

thoughts and deeds. Destroy all our crooked sins. For the sake of being purified from that, we offer Thee our best salutations.

SANKARA'S COMMENTARY.

18. By this verse again the dying Soul prays for clear passage. "Agne naya"—O Fire, lead Thou by the good path ('supathâ') by the pleasant passage. The word 'supathâ,' 'good path,' is an adjective showing that the other path called the "Southern path" is to be avoided. I am disgusted with the southern path wherein there is a constant circle of births and deaths, therefore I again entreat Thee to lead me by that beautiful way which is free from transmigration. "Kâye"—for the sake of wealth, i. e. for the sake of enjoying the fruits of action, "Asman, &c"—O Effulgent One! Thou knowest ('vidvân') all ('visvâni') these works ('vayunâni') or thoughts and dispositions consisting of the above mentioned fruits of duty. Moreover, destroy ('yuyodhi') and purge away from us ('asmâd') the crooked ('juhurâṇam'), the evil sins ('enah'), the sense is that thereby we, becoming pure, may obtain the desired end; but unfortunately now we cannot serve Thee fully ('Bhūyistham') with due rites. Therefore we offer ('vidhema') or serve Thee ('te') with 'namas' only, i. e., by merely 'uttering' the word "Salutation," (for not having the physical body, we cannot even bow down to Thee in salutation, but can only utter the word salutation.)

ANANTA'S COMMENTARY.

18. Having thus prayed to obtain direct vision of God, the sage prays to Him as the tutelary Deity of Fire, in order to obtain emancipation. 'Agni, &c.' As says Kâtayâna Smṛiti: "Agastya dristâgneya devatyâ ante yajñân yogi smârayati."

O 'Deva'! having the qualities of playfulness, &c, O 'Agni'! O God manifest as the symbol Fire! lead ('naya') and carry us by the good path ('supathâ'), the beautiful road, the way of the Gods ('Devayâna'). 'The good path' implies that the other path called the Southern Path is to be avoided. We pray to Thee therefore O 'Agni'! because we are disgusted with the Southern Path, the path of eternal births and deaths. Therefore lead us by the happy way, free from the evils of rebirths and reincarnations, who are endowed with the fruits of works. The word सुपथः is the instrumental singular of 'supatha.' Its regular declension ought to be supathena, because though पथः is regular, 3rd case singular of—पथिस्, yet 'supathâ' is a compound and ends in च, by rule V: 4, 74 of 'Pāṇini,' its 3rd singular ought to be सुपथेन. But the contrary use in the text shows that the 'samâsânta rule is not invariable, the final च being optional, as it is not employed in the very first 'sûtra' of 'Pāṇini,' where the compound चादेच् ends in a consonant.

Why does the sage pray to be led by the good path? 'Râye': for the sake of getting wealth in the shape of final liberation. What is Thy nature, O 'Agni'? Thou knowest ('vidvân'), all ('visvâni'), works ('vayunâni'); and intelligences Juhurâṇam:—crooked; it is derived from the root 'hurchhâ' to be crooked; by a reduplication of the root and affixing 'ânach,' it means crooked; deceitful, obstructing. 'Enah'—Sins, 'asmatah' 'away from us.' 'Yuyodhi'.—separate, remove, destroy. This is derived from the root

'yn' to separate, belonging to the 'adâdi' class, the 'vikaraṇa śap' being elided, there is reduplication, then is added ~~ḥ~~ the sign of the imperative mood, 'hi' being changed to 'dhi' in the 'Vedaś' for the sake of being purified from that. 'Te':—thee. The substitute 'yuṣmad' comes because it is 'anudâtta. Bhûyisthâm':—best, 'Nama nktim' words of salutations. 'Vidhema':—we may do. The purport is, that to salute Thee who art so great a help in accomplishing our dear objects of desire, is the only requital we can offer Thee as taught by traditional usage, it is not a return for the services Thou hast rendered to us, for these can never be adequately requited.

Or this verse may mean—O Brilliant Agni! lead ('naya') us by the good path, which is free from transmigration, and known as the path of light &c., so that we may obtain the wealth ('râye') i.e., the treasure of salvation i.e., be Thou the giver of liberation. Liberation from what? From the round of transmigration, O God! For Thou knowest (veda) all good works (vayunâni) performed by us to entitle ourselves to liberation. 'Vayunam' means work or Karmas, says the 'Nighaṇṭa.' Or 'vayunâni' may mean wisdom or acts for acquiring Brahma-jñâna (i.e., understanding, pondering over 'manana') and profound meditation upon Spiritual Truths. For the word 'vaynna' means wisdom in the following 'śloka' of Bhāgawata:—"Na tvad dattayâ vayunayâ." If it be asked how can there be thy liberation since Thou art bound by thy karmic destiny? The text replies 'juhurâṇam' &c., i.e., give us liberation by destroying our sins, lessening their weight, and making us free.

Because the doing even of a little sin throws one into the cycle of transmigration. The word "juhur" is derived from the root 'hvar' 'to walk,' by reduplication, as if it was a root belonging to the 'Hnâdi' class, and means 'constant walking to and fro.' This is a 'Vedic' exception. 'Enam':—sin; i.e., such a sin as causes constant coming and going ('juharâṇa'), i.e., evil deeds. Those deeds remove ('yuyodhi') from us ('asmât') O God! we offer Thee our best salutations, because we cannot requite Thee in any other way.

A DISCUSSION.

The commentator 'Śrī Śaṅkarācārya,' having explained the verses according to the meaning of the words, now enters into a discussion as to the drift of the whole work. The whole question turns upon this : "Do the words 'vidyā' and 'amṛitam' refer to the 'Brahma Jñāna' and liberation, or to inferior knowledge and quasi-liberation?" The settlement of this dispute is important, in as much as there can be no two doctrines so diametrically opposed as the doctrine of renunciation of work when 'Brahma Jñāna' is obtained, and the doctrine of union of work with 'Jñāna' even after illumination. Says the opponent :—"This dispute is as to the interpretation of a scriptural text, and it should be settled by reference to scriptural texts and arguments deduced therefrom, and not by mere logical reasoning. To establish therefore the opposition or non-opposition of 'Karma' and Jñāna, the scriptural argument is the only argument admissible;" 'Śaṅkara' admits the soundness of this restriction, and says "yes, we prove from scriptural argument that there is opposition between these two;" and he quotes the 'Śruti' of the 'Kāthopniṣad' to show that there is opposition. Again urges the other side, "what then? We are dealing with this, and not with 'Katha'." "But the 'Śruti' of the 'Īśopniṣad' does not show any opposition. To this we rejoin. "You should not say so, for if you admit that there are contradictory texts, one establishing opposition, and the other establishing non opposition, then there is no possibility of reconciling these texts by making them optional." There are two sacrificial texts, one enjoining that the sacrifice should be performed before sunrise, and the other that it should be performed after sunrise; and these contradictory texts are harmonised by saying that it is optional for a sacrificer to perform the sacrifice either before sunrise or after sunrise: as it is a matter which is altogether left to the choice of the man. The opponent says: "Let us make it therefore as optional by force of the rule enjoining combination." To this we reply "No. The 'Brahma-vidyā' and 'avidyā' cannot possibly combine, as the knowledge of something being silver and the true knowledge of its being merely mother of pearl only shining like silver cannot possibly combine, so the rule of combination does not apply here."

For, if the rule of combination were to apply here, then one must argue thus :—"by force of this rule, it will follow that there is no opposition between 'Jñāna' and 'Karma,' and since there is no opposition between 'Jñāna' and 'Karma,' they should be combined, and thus their combination is established." This is nothing if not arguing in a vicious circle. If it be argued, "admitting that 'Jñāna and Karma' are demonstrated as incapable of co-existing at one and the same time, let us take them in succession." To this we reply "If you say that first 'Karma' should be performed, and then one should devote himself to 'Jñāna' exclusively, we say that we also say the same thing, there is no difference of opinion between us here, if this order of performance be adopted. But if you say that a man should first acquire 'Jñāna' and then perform 'Karma,' we join issue. For this order of succession is impossible. Because by 'Jñāna' there will be the total destruction of 'Avidyā,' and no germ remaining, the 'avidyā,' can never manifest again in such a person." If it

be said, "admitting that 'avidyā' being destroyed there will be no recrudescence of it, yet such a person will perform works of 'avidyā' still, for we see many wise men performing works, viz, explaining, lecturing, begging alms, and wandering about, &c," we reply 'avidyā' being destroyed, its effects also will not reappear. For 'Karma' or work is that which is performed owing to an impulse or motive arising. According to a 'Vedio' text, such a 'Karma' you want to combine with 'Jñāna'. But when a man realizes the unity of 'Brahman' by clear perception, in him there will be no impulse or motive prompting him to work; because he has no desires; while impulse or motive exists where there is some desire. Because says the 'Smṛiti': "No action is ever seen here to be performed by a person who has no desires, every thing that a living being does is done through the prompting of desire." The begging of alms, wandering, &c, performed by the wise are done to preserve the body, and in order to exhaust 'karma' which still lingers as traces of 'Avidyā'. Such acts of the wise are not 'karmas,' because the element of impulse or motive is lacking. For so long as there is union of life and body, such 'quasi-karmas' are necessary; but the wise do not think them to be their own acts, because they are above 'avidyā' which is the parent of 'karmas,' and because they think "I am doing nothing."

As to the objection "why by the term immortality in verse 11, liberation is not meant and by 'vidyā' the knowledge or supreme spirit," we reply, "the immortality referred to is only relative. For were it absolute immortality, then the begging of entrance by the subsequent verses would be incongruous and incompatible, for the 'Śruti' says that "the vital winds of a 'Jñāni' do not go out at the time of death as with ordinary mortals, not on the contrary he is merged in 'Brahman' even here and enjoys 'Brahman,' &c." Therefore the principal meaning of 'Amṛitam' should be taken as applying here, but its secondary meaning, viz, a state analogous to immortality but not absolute immortality.

With regard to the verses 'by avidyā' crossing death, one attains Immortality through vidyā," "by destruction crossing death, by asambhūti one enjoys Immortality." As this may seem open to doubt, we shall further attempt to give an explanation. We shall first state the nature of the doubt that might be raised, which is as follows:—

*Objection:—*By the word 'vidyā' is meant primarily knowledge of the Supreme Self; why is it taken in a different sense here, and why does not the word 'amṛita' mean complete Immortality following from such knowledge? If it is urged, that as a matter of experience these two cannot combine, because the works and knowledge of the Supreme Self are opposed to one another; we say, True; the opposition is not self manifest; for both opposition or non-opposition depend upon the authority of the Sacred Scriptures. Just as the performance of sacrifices and ('avidyā') the worship of Brahman (vidyā) are matters of scriptural proof, so also the question of their opposition or non-opposition is a matter for authority and not inference. Thus as it is learned from the Scripture "thou shalt not kill any creature;" so that very Scripture makes an exception by declaring "Let beasts be killed in sacrifice." So let there be a combination of 'vidyā' (spiritual knowledge) and works (karma).

Reply :—No, that cannot be, because another ‘Śruti’ says :— ‘those two,’ ignorance (‘avidyā’) and knowledge (‘vidyā’), are known to be far asunder, and to lead to different goals ” (Kath. I 2. 4).

Objection :—No, there is no opposition between ‘vidyā’ and ‘avidyā,’ as the ‘Śruti’ couples them together, in the text ‘vidyāñ cha avidyāñ cha.’

Answer :—We reply no There is threefold opposition in these, viz., opposition in their respective causes, essences, and results

Objection :—It being impossible to hold that opposition or non-opposition between ‘vidyā’ and ‘avidyā’ Either is optional (for that rule of interpretation does not apply here by which two contrary precepts are held optional, such as, let a man sacrifice before sunrise, let a man sacrifice after sunrise, these are interpreted to mean that the time is optional with the performer) ; it therefore follows that there is no opposition between ‘vidyā’ and ‘avidyā’ as the rule of conjoining these shows To this we reply.

Answer :—No, because there is the text of the ‘Kaṭha-upaniṣad’ to the contrary, showing that both cannot consist.

Objection :—Let ‘vidyā’ and ‘avidyā’ be in the same person in succession, at different stages of his life.

Answer :—No. Because when knowledge arises, ignorance having disappeared, there can no more be an experiencing ignorance. One who knows that fire is hot and luminous, is ever afterwards incapable of thinking that fire is cold, or non-luminous.—Similarly in the case of one enlightened by knowledge there can never again arise ignorance, doubt or false knowledge. For the ‘Śruti’ says that grief and delusion are impossible, for such a one ; because “ when a man knows that all things are even as the soul, when he beholds the unity of the self then there is no delusion, nor grief.” Thus there being no possibility of ‘avidyā’ co-existing with ‘vidyā’ we say that the sacrificial works also, which are concomitants of ‘avidyā,’ cannot exist for one who is illumined.

As regards the text “ He enjoys Immortality”, in verses 11 and 14, the Immortality spoken of is only relative. Moreover if by ‘vidyā’ in these verses be meant the knowledge of the Supreme Self, then the beginning of the passage to solar region &c., becomes a redundancy Therefore it follows that ‘vidyā’ in these verses should be taken as synonymous with prayers and inferior knowledge, and the sense conveyed is that sacrifices should be combined with prayers, and not with the knowledge of the Supreme Self ; as we have already explained.

NOTES.

Introduction. Almost all 'Vedic Mantras' are used for performing sacrifices or some acts connected with sacrifices and other Kāmya works. Thus some 'Mantras' are recited while 'Kṛṣṇagrass' is cut, others while the sacred 'soma' is pressed, and so on. But these Īśāvāsyā verses are not used for such purposes. The 'Ātmā' is not a 'Karma-śeṣa' or the product or effect of an act, all 'Karma-śeṣa' objects are divided into four classes viz, 1. 'Utpādya, Visible,' purely artificial as 'Purodāsa cakes &c,' 2. 'Vikārya,' only modifications of the original (as 'soma-juice') 3. 'Āpya' objects which, though, neither capable of artificial change, nor modification, and which though, always remaining unchanged, become objects of human act by being capable of acquisition; such as 'Vedic Mantras.' The 'Mantras' are eternal, but they may be acquired by human acts. 4. 'Saniś-kārya:—Objects which are capable of purification, as barley &c. The objects governed by all transitive verbs must fall within one of the above categories; and so is the case with all sacrificial acts. But not so with 'Ātman.' Not only is it not an object, it is not even an agent, for it is not 'Kartā' nor 'Bhoktā' (agent and enjoyer). So it is above all relationship to acts. It is in fact opposed to acts, for even a temporary realization of the universality and unity of 'Ātman,' makes one disgusted with works and turn his face from these. Nor can these 'Upaniṣad Mantras' be employed in 'Japa,' &c., 'because all 'Upaniṣads' have only one object in view—to teach about 'Ātman.' The 'tātparya' or the real aim or object of a document or book is understood by six signs, viz, 1. 'Upakrama and Upasamhāra':—Introduction and conclusion. 2. 'Abhyāsa:—Repetition 3. 'Apūrvatā':—statement of a new, unprecedented proposition. 4. 'Phalam':—the fruit or object gained. 5. 'Ārthavāda':—explanatory statement showing the importance of a thing or rule by its eulogy, and by censuring its contrary. 6. 'Yukti upapatti'.—demonstration or reason. Applying these tests, we find that the scope of this 'Upaniṣad' is also the teaching of the unity of the 'Ātman'. Thus its introduction is "by 'Ātman' is pervaded the whole universe," and its conclusion is "I am the same 'Puruṣa'" or "He is brilliant without body, all-pervading &c" 2. The repetition is, "He does not move, He is one, He is inside of all, &c" 3. The unprecedented proposition is "Gods even cannot obtain Him" 4. The fruit of this Knowledge is, "Then there is no delusion nor grief when one sees the Unity." 5. The eulogy and censure are, "They go to regions of Asuras who do not know the 'Ātman'" "And doing works let him wish to live a hundred years." 6. And lastly the reason is given in these words "Because 'mātarīśva' or the great life Force even performs all his functions through the help of the 'Ātman'." Such is the teaching of all the 'Upaniṣads'. Moreover, other works like the 'Gītā' &c,' quoting from the 'Upaniṣads,' show that this is the object of all 'Upaniṣads.'

Similarly 'Karma-kāṇḍa' is diametrically opposed to 'Jñāna-kāṇḍa': thus while sacrifices ordain the killing of animals, the 'Jñāna' opposes it. In fact 'Karma-kāṇḍa' is meant only for those who have false notions about 'Ātman'. For Jaimini, the great author of the 'Purva-Mīmāṃsā' a book devoted to 'Karma-kāṇḍa,' shows by implication that 'karmas' are only

meant for those who have not true notions of 'Ātman'. Thus in the sixth chapter of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā, Jaimini shows that one who desires Heaven, who is a twice-born, who is not permanently disfigured by the loss of a limb &c, is alone entitled to perform a sacrifice. This shows by implication that such a man still has the false notion that he is a twice-born, that he is not lame, &c, 'Ātmā' is neither a Brāhman nor a Śūdra, nor afflicted by any bodily affections and defects. With a false notion, one can never desire anything; for the 'Ātman' is actionless like space, free from all sorrows, and is the highest bliss, so one who says: Let me have happiness, let me have no pain, or who thinks 'I am able bodied, I have no bodily defects,' &c., has certainly a false notion of his self.

The four 'Anubandhas' spoken of in this book are, 1. 'Adhikāri':—one desirous of removing his ignorance concerning Self, and which is the cause of all sorrows. Such a one is fit to study this science. 2. 'Visaya':—To prove the unity of 'Ātman' and its true nature is the object of this book. 3. 'Sambandha' the connection between the words and the idea they convey of the true nature of 'Ātman', or the subjective concept standing at once as reason and conclusion. 4. 'Prayojana':—Removal of natural ignorance in view to cause the manifestation of the bliss of the True Self as the object of this book, ('Ānandagiri').

'Verse 1' Though the word ईशा is formed by adding an affix meaning agency, yet 'Ātmā' is not an agent. Its connection with Māyā makes it appear as agent. The ruler pre-supposes a thing ruled: and hence the question would naturally arise whether there is no duality in 'Ātmā'. This doubt can easily be dispelled. As there would be as many reflections of the same object as there are mirrors in a room to reflect it, so 'Ātmā', which reflects in all, is the Ruler of all the images that reflect it, being their prototype. ('Ānandagiri').

According to 'Uvatāchārya' the phrase 'tena tyaktena, &c,' means:—"enjoy all objects by renouncing the idea of thy own proprietary relationship with them: say not 'they are mine.'" The notion that this is mine, I am the owner of it, is 'avidyā.' He only is entitled to 'yoga' who has renounced this notion.

According to 'Śankarānanda', this and the second verse are the principal verses in the whole 'Upaniṣad', the rest are but explanations and expansions of these. Thus verse 3 explains 'mā-gṛīdhā' "covet not," for those who covet riches go to 'Āsuric' births; verse 4 expands the idea of the Ruler (Īśa), &c. According to him the first half teaches that we should get the notion that all is God, the second half teaches the way of acquiring this notion, namely by renouncing all desires. 'Tena' 'by that world,' 'tyaktena' being taken, 'grihitena,' in the sense of being all god, eat thou ('bhujithā') or-enjoy constantly the bliss of the 'Divine' presence.

According to Rāmachandra Pandit, 'Vāsya' means 'āchchhādite-dūrīkṛite : i.e., the idea of the world should be removed altogether by the idea of God, as the false idea of a snake is 'covered' or removed by the true idea of

a rope which was mistaken for a snake. According to 'Anandabhatta, vāṣyam-sarvesu svakāryeṣu svakāraṇabhūte nivāsyam.'

Verse 2. In the first verse, three propositions have been laid down. The first half of the verse or two 'padas' teach the Divine Truth, the third 'pada' enjoins 'Sannyāsa (vidhi)' for him whose knowledge of Truth is matured, and the fourth 'pada' lays down a restrictive rule ('niyama') for a 'Sannyāsi.' In the first Mantra, 'Jñāna' is taught, in the second 'Karma' is enjoined. But lest some one should fall into the error of combining these two and perform them collectively, 'Śrī Śankarāchārya' shows that they are not to be so compounded; the 'adhikāris' being different, and these being mutually exclusive. If a person should say.—'Jñāna' and 'Karma' being two opposites, cannot co-exist at one and the same time in the same person, any more than the duties of a celibate student and the duties of a married man can; yet they should come in succession, as a student after 'Brahmacharya' gets married, a person after acquiring 'jñāna' should perform 'Karmas', we reply that that cannot be, the cases are different and the 'adhikāris' are different. If it be urged "'jñāna and karmas' are both ordained by the Vedās, and both are equally pure, therefore there is no opposition between them," we say this is wrong. If it be said "both have no application to the same person," we say 'so is the case here'? If it be said "celibacy and marriage cannot be combined, as there is prohibition," we say "here also there is prohibition. As in the text 'na karmāṇā, &c,' " ('Br Ar')'. If it be said "that prohibition refers to mere 'karma' devoid of 'jñāna, and' not to 'karma plus jñāna,'" we say "that is not so, because there is no such qualifying word as 'mere' ('kevala') in the text." Moreover our own text shows that 'karmas' are enjoined to one who has a desire of life, while a 'jñāni' is told not to have even the desire of life. Moreover 'karmas' can be performed by one who has riches, while a 'jñāni' is told not to have riches. Therefore it follows that the 'adhikāri' of the first 'mantra' is not the 'adhikāri' of the second 'mantra.' Moreover, the fruit of these two are different. the fruit of 'jñāna' is total cessation of all delusion and grief, the fruit of 'karmas' is the attainment of various heavens and states up to the state of becoming a personal God ('Hiraṇyagarbha') (Āṇandagiri, condensed)

According to 'Uvata,' the second verse applies to the yogi who has no desires, he should perform 'karmas' in order to get 'Jñāna'. "Performing works here in order to get salvation, desire thou to live for a hundred years, by eating healthy, nutritious food in this way is thy salvation assured, and in no other: the works done in order to obtain salvation do not contaminate, because they exhaust their power in the act of conferring salvation"

According to 'Śankarānanda,' the verse is addressed to one who desires salvation but cannot renounce riches. 'Tvayī':—in thee will arise 'varāgya' about riches also in time.

According to 'Rāmachandra Paṇḍit,' the word 'eva' means 'kevala,' "merely," that is, 'merely performing works and not desiring their fruits' This verse is addressed to the same person as the first. Having stated that he who has renounced all desires is entitled to 'Sannyāsa,' this verse shows the

means of renouncing desires, viz., by the purification of the heart, which depends upon 'karma'. For the 'Mumukṣu' there is no other way than 'niṣkāma karma,' because the heart being purified by this, one shall be entitled to 'Sannyāsa.'

Verse 3. The ignorant not knowing the self, think that 'Ātmā' sins, suffers &c. This false defamation of self is killing the self. ('Ānandgiri').

'Uvata' says: This verse applies to those who perform 'karma' in order to obtain heaven, &c. Because such persons are born and die again and again, they are slayers of self.

'Sankarānanda' says. those who desire riches are 'asurās,' they kill the all-pervading, all-mighty self by coveting riches

'Rāmachandra Paṇḍit' says; 'asurās' are those who find pleasure ('ramanti') in life ('asu') only, feeders of life only. 'Loka':—localities like hell, &c, and births like birds, beasts, &c. Those who deny the existence of Self are slayers of self.

Verse 4 If the 'ātman' is motionless and one, how is it that one goes to heaven and another goes to hell. this doubt is removed by saying that it is 'manas' that goes, Ātman appears to enjoy and suffer by 'upādhi' only. Ātman being in the closest connection with 'manas', cannot be an object of cognition to manas, in other words since it pervades manas, it cannot be cognised by the mind. All 'Vedic' works like 'Soma', milk, are prepared by water, therefore 'āpaḥ' or water means figuratively all 'karmas' also. The vital functions also are performed through water. The supreme self is the oversoul or the Personal God ('Īśvara') or Hiraṇyagarbha ('Ānandagiri')

'Uvata' says. It is one in the form of 'vijñānaghana'—a mass of all consciousness. It is quicker than mind, because it is the cause that gives the motive impulse to the mind. According to 'Uvata', the word is 'arsāt' and not 'aisat'. It comes from the root 'risati' 'to injure' with the negative particle, one who is indestructible is 'arsāt'. All sacrifices are placed in 'Vāyu', through whom they reach the 'Ātman' i.e., the Ātman is the ultimate substratum of all sacrifices, &c

'Sankarānanda' says:—'It does not shake' i.e., it is not 'Vāyn' or 'Prāṇa', 'It is one' i.e., free from the duality of bodies. It is neither body, nor vital force, nor even mind. Pūrvam arśat:—it is gone before, it is all going; 'mātariśva' means 'sūtrātmā', the collectivity of 'Jīvā', it is so called because it gets its existence ('śvasati') in the mother (mātari), or the great unmanifest. it is the first manifestation, being the power of knowledge and will ('jñāna-kriyā Śakti') all the creation is directly produced by 'Sūtrātmā'

'Rāmachandra Paṇḍit'.—pūrvam—eternal, beginningless: 'arsāt':—indestructible 'Mātariśva'.—the life force in the body, it being in the body, the functions ('āpaḥ') perform ('dhārayati') their respective works of respiration, digestion, &c. The organs are called 'āpaḥ' since by it, the 'vāyu' receives its various names of 'prāṇa,' &c, ('āpyante prāṇādī sajjñā yābhīstā āpaḥ')

Verse 6. 'Uvaṭa' reads 'vichikiti' instead of 'vijugupsati. It means "He has no doubts."

'Śaṅkarānanda' says: this verse is a commentary on the third 'pāda' of the first verse. He who realizes that he and Īśa are one, does not reproach or praise any one.

'Ānandabhaṭṭa' says:—'jugupsati' comes from the root 'gnp' to protect' means "he does not exist to protect his frail body; for having seen the eternal pure 'ātman', he does not consider 'prāṇa' to be the life-giver of the body."

Verse 7. 'Śaṅkarānanda' says grief or 'śoka' means 'vikṣepa' of distraction, and delusion or 'moha' means 'āvaraṇa,' the veil that covers the Self; the two polar forces of the universe—action and re-action, positive and negative.

'Rāmachandra Pandit':—vijānataḥ:—knowing, i. e., realizing the self by direct 'vision' The 'knower of Brahman' having removed 'āvaraṇa and vikṣepa (śoka and moha),' becomes 'Jivan-Mukta'

According to Ānandabhaṭṭa, 'moha' means mental distraction and 'śoka' refers to transmigration.

Verse 8. 'Kaviḥ'—he who knows the past, present and the future ('Ānandagiri').

According to 'Uvaṭa' this verse means 'He who knows the 'ātman' as above described attains 'paryāgātman,' who is brilliant, all knowledge and Bliss, and almighty, &c, and by attaining 'ātman,' he becomes 'kaviḥ,' allwise, he becomes 'maṇiṣi' intelligent, 'prabhū' all-pervading through power of the knowledge of nature, and 'svayambhū' self existent through the power of spiritual knowledge of 'Brahman'; he ordains all things according to their natures, that is, he enjoys animate and inanimate nature by renouncing the idea of self-proprietorship; having done works to get eternal years.

'Śaṅkarānanda' also favours this interpretation, viz, 'paryāgāt' active finite verb governing 'śukram,' &c, in the objective case. The pronoun 'sa'—refers to the knower of 'Brahman'—so also the words 'kaviḥ &c,' refer to him, i. e., the knower of 'Brahman' obtains 'Brahman' and becomes 'kaviḥ, &c.'

He who conquers ('paribhavyati) Avidyā' is 'paribhū yāthātathyataḥ:—having determined the end and the means of accomplishing it.

'Rāmachandra Pandit' also is in favor of the above interpretation. 'Apāpa-viddham' untainted by virtue and vice; virtue is a sin in as much as it causes rebirth. 'samābhya':—years, i. e., 'prajāpatis, the builders or creators of the universe; or for eternal years, he has laid by a store of enjoyment and knows 'Brahman,' and by so knowing has become 'kaviḥ, &c Maṇiṣi':—pure-intellect or mind free from the idea of duality.

'Verse 9.' The above seven verses are meant for 'sannyāsins,' the remaining verses of this 'Upaniṣad' as well as verse two are for worldly men who are struggling on the path to 'sannyāsa.' It should not be objected that "the subject-matter of all 'Upaniṣads' being 'Brahma-vidyā,' this division of one 'Upaniṣad' into two halves is improper." Because other 'Upaniṣads' also

contain two divisions—esoteric and exoteric, such as the worship of ‘prāṇa, &c.’ Nor should it be said that it is a portion of ‘Brāhman-jīvan,’ because the result of such worship, &c., is different. Moreover all works depend upon desires, such as ‘let me have wife, let me have wealth to perform sacrifices, as shown in the ‘Bṛihadāraṇyaka’: So when a person has not in objective reality a wife and wealth, his desire creates a mental wife and wealth, as is shown in that very ‘Upaniṣad’ “Let me have a wife, let me have a son, let me have wealth, let me perform work. So far do desires verily extend. Therefore also now a person when alone desires, let me have a wife, &c. As long as he does not obtain them, he thinks himself incomplete. His completeness is this, that the mind is his self and speech his wife, his son, and the eye his wealth, &c.,” all these are the results of ‘avidyā’ (‘Ānandagiri’).

The seven provisions of foods are mentioned in ‘Br. A. I 5 1,’ “of the seven provisions which the Father created by understanding and penance, &c.” They are one for man, two for Gods, three for himself, and one for animals. First the ordinary well-known food of man, the two foods of Gods are offerings called ‘Darśa and Pānamāsa’ sacrifices or ‘Huta and Prahuta’ offerings; 4, 5 and 6, the three foods of his own are all those means of these enjoyments, viz., the mind, speech and ‘prāṇa,’ and the one food of animals is the milk. These seven provisions were created by the Father, viz. the sacrificer who created all these through knowledge and work by performing good and bad works, he, therefore, directly or indirectly is the Father or Creator of the whole world of enjoyments and sufferings, he is the Creator of his environment; and thinking falsely that these are his and he has created them, he is bound to the chain of transmigration. (‘Ānandgiri’) The ‘Mantra Iśāvāsya,’ &c. teach ‘Brahma-vidyā,’ and this ‘Brahma-vidyā’ is the subject discussed in the previous eight verses, therefore does not the context (‘prakaraṇa’) show that the ‘Vidyā’ referred to in this ninth verse is ‘Brahma-vidyā’ and that the ‘Śrūti’ means that ‘Brahma-vidyā’ should be combined with ‘avidyā’ or work? Such an interpretation is wrong. The context is not always an infallible guide as to the combination of two things. We must see whether the things are *per se* of a nature whose union is compatible or not. Two acts should be combined only when one of them being completed, the end desired is not attained, and the second act becomes necessary to remove the obstruction that prevents the manifestation of the fruit. In that case only one act becomes the co-adjutor of the other. But this is not the case with ‘Brahma-vidyā’ and ‘avidyā work.’

For ‘Brahma-vidyā’ is complete in itself and does not stand in need of a co-adjutant act. For the very act of seeing the unity of the Self produces instantaneously the result in the shape of the removal of grief and delusion; so the result not being delayed there is no necessity of a co-adjutant act in the shape of works (‘avidyā’). Moreover in the ‘Bṛihadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad’ it is said “through study, through faith, through penance and through sacrifices let one wish to know ‘Brahman.’ Here ‘yajñena’ is in the third case, and so it is clear that the relation of sacrifice to ‘Brahma-vidyā’ is that of an instrument to a principal act, and thus occupies the position of an inferior or subordinate act. therefore it can never be a co-ordinate or a co-adjutor to ‘Brahma-vidyā,’ and therefore it is wrong merely on the strength of the context to make ‘Brahma-vidyā’ co-ordinate with ‘karma.’ Moreover if it was intended to enjoin co-ordination of the great ‘Brahma-vidyā’ with works, then the dispraise of ‘vidyā’ in the text becomes also illogical; what was the necessity of this dispraise? Hence it follows that

these following verses enjoin the conjunction of 'Deva-vidyā' with 'karma,' (and not of 'Brahma-vidyā' with 'karma') for the first two do not exclude each other, as do the latter. Nor should it be doubted that the fruit of 'Devatā-jñāna' is nothing more than that of 'karma'; so there can be no conjunction of these two. For the fruit of 'Devatā-jñāna' is 'Devaloka,' and of 'karma' is 'Pitriloka.' Moreover, the dispraise in the text is only for the sake of showing the necessity of combining 'Devatā-jñāna' with 'karma'; and it should not be taken to mean that those two taken separately by themselves were really worthless and ineffectual, as some would have it. Because these even when separately performed have their good effects in the shape of 'Deva-loka and 'Pitriloka.' So the dispraise in the 'Śruti' is a mere rhetorical way of recommending the union of 'Devatā-jñāna' with 'karma,' and should not be taken in its literal sense. ('Ānandagiri')

'Uvata': 'avidyā':—'karmas' done with the desire of obtaining heaven, &c. 'Vidyā': the knowledge of 'Ātmā' only, divorced from 'karma'

'Sankarānanda':—Those who desire wealth and riches enter into the state of egotism; or 'avidyā' refers to the covetous persons mentioned in verse 2, and 'vidyā' to those who say 'I am Brahman' having realised 'Brahman'

Verses 10 & 11 'Amrita' is explained as liberation by 'Uvata', and becoming one with 'Brahman' by 'Sankarānanda': 'Mriṣyn' or 'death' referring to the obstacle preventing the realization of the knowledge of 'Ātman': forgetfulness, want of concentration

Verses 12, 13, 14. According to 'Uvata' the worshippers of 'asambhūti' are the 'Lokāyatas' or materialists who say the soul is perishable with the body, there is no rebirth, and that it is absorbed into 'Prakṛiti' after death, as one is in deep sleep without dreams ('susupti'). Such persons, because they hold these doctrines in their life, will after death go into a state of unconscious lethargy, and obtain 'prakṛiti laya.' Here it is not the unconscious 'prakṛiti' that gives the fruit to its worshipper, but the supreme God, in accordance with the beliefs of men. just as he rewards 'a karma vādin' in accordance with his 'karmas' ('Ānandagiri')

'Sambhūti-ratāḥ':—refers according to 'Uvata,' to the worshippers of 'Ātmā,' those who say, there is nothing else than 'Ātmā': and do not perform 'karmas.'

Verses 15 Health of the body, cows, land, gold, &c.. are human wealth, 'manusam-vittam,' while knowledge of God is 'Divine wealth or daivam vittam.' ('Ānandagiri').

'Uvata adds':—'Om kham (Brahma) after this, verse, "Om Akāśa is Brahma." This reading is not in the text.

According to 'Bhimsen Pandit,' the learned follower of 'Swāmī Dayānanda Sarasvatī,' this verse means a golden screen which covers the face of Truth i.e., love of gold prevents one seeing the Truth.

Verses 17. According to 'Uvata,' the term 'Vāyu' means 'Linga Śarīra' consisting of sensation, five organs of action, the mind, five 'Mahābhūtas' and 'Jīvātmā. Amritam'—the Supreme 'Brahman Om':—is the name or form of 'Brahman O Kratu': remember me now, help me now. 'Kratu' may mean either fire or sacrifice. Instead of 'kritam,' he reads 'kḥbe': which means "in order to attain worlds."

According to 'Ānandabhaṭṭa, Kratu' means 'Viṣṇu,' the presiding deity of sacrifice: 'Om' is the only 'savior' at the time of death.

534314

Q1:242:9 (R65) E9

KENA UPANIṢAD.

Kena Upanisad

its interpretation according to

SANKARA'S SCHOOL.

This is also called Talavakāra Upaniṣad. In a manuscript in Sārada character in the Adyar Library, it is called Brāhmaṇopaniṣad. It is called Kena from the first word of the Upaniṣad. It forms, according to Śankara, the ninth chapter of the Brāhmaṇa of that name. For a long time the very existence of the Talavakāra Brāhmaṇa was doubted. But of late a manuscript of it has been found by Dr. Burnell, and so the statement of Śankara that this Upaniṣad forms part of the Talavakāra Brāhmaṇa has been verified. This Brāhmaṇa appertains to the Sāma Veda and is called Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa also.

This Upaniṣad contains the well known allegory of the victory of the Devas over the Daityas, and the ignorance of the Devas that the victory was due really to the working of the Brahman through them.

Prāṇa root of Karmas :—

The Prāṇa—the Universal, All-Supporting Life—is the father of all Karmas, all actions, theurgic or simple. The practical Occultism or Karma-kāṇḍa therefore naturally deals with Prāṇa, its various modifications and the method of utilising it. All this has been dealt with in the previous eight Chapters of the Talavakāra Brāhmaṇa, of which Kenopaniṣad forms the ninth or the last Chapter. This deals with pure Brahma Vidyā

द्विषोत्तरमृती ॥ Two Samsāra-Paths :—

The Karmas are of various kinds, Nitya, Naimittika, &c. They may be performed either with the knowledge of the theory underlying them or empirically. If performed without knowledge, they lead the performer to the Dakṣināyana—the path of Re-birth. If performed with knowledge, they lead to the Northern Path—the Brahma-loka from which there is no return till the end of the Kalpa. The fruit of Karma is therefore Samsāra—on the higher or the lower scale. The higher is going to the Brahma-loka and enjoying its bliss for a Kalpa, the lower is going the round of birth on earth, Death, the Kāmaloka, the Deva-loka (Svarga or Devachan) and back to the Earth. This Trilokī circle—the Earth, Pitriloka and Swarga—is the Lower Samsāra : the round generally trod by all souls. Some more highly developed souls by combining knowledge with Karma, have broken through this evolutionary circle, and have reached fixity and deathlessness in the highest world—the Brahma-loka. But they also must pass away at the end of the Kalpa—and in Eternity a Kalpa is as much a moment as a Trilokī life-cycle.

Niṣkāma Karmas purify the sattva :—

But there is a method by which the Karmas may lead to the Highest End. It is the Path of Sacrifice, the performance of Karmas without desire of reward, for the Karmas when performed with this altruistic motive purify the soul (Sattva). He whose Sattva is purified, who has organised his body of Sat, the Hiraṇmaya Kośa, as in the lower grades of occultism

he organised his Vijñānamaya and Ananda-maya Kosas—becomes a co-worker with Sat-chid-ānanda, and the last obstacle to Ātma-jñāna is removed; then arises the Desire to know the True Ātma—the Piatyāgatma the Over soul—and such an Adhikārī asks. “by whom ordained goes the Manas towards its object, by whose command does the Primeval Prāṇa flow, &c.”

मृत्युपद ज्ञानं Ignorance is death :—

The Ignorance is death, literally, not metaphorically. Reason, quiet reason, tells us that matter is eternal, we cannot create an atom, we cannot destroy an atom. Our bodies, therefore, of whatever matter they may be formed, never die, the molecules change arrangement. The same Reason also tells us that the Soul, the Self, is the unifying element of all our conceptions and perceptions; it is because of this Unity that there is harmony in our thoughts. The Soul is essentially, therefore, a Unit, a Simple Substance, and therefore Death in the form of molecular rearrangement is not predicable of Self for as It has no molecules there can be no rearrangement. It therefore is Eternal. Whence then this idea of Death, this terror of Death? Ignorance. Ignorance of the fact that the bodies being aggregations of matter, of molecules, must disintegrate, ignorance of the fact that the Self being a Simple Substance can never disintegrate. The proof of the Immortality of the Self is in the Self. Nothing external can prove it. If the “spirit” of a dead person were to materialise on this Earth and tell us that it is living; it will not prove the Immortality of the Self. It will only prove, if the whole thing be not a hallucination, a mental picture, that there are subtler forms of matter invisible to the ordinary eye, and bodies made of that matter which do not disintegrate with the disintegration of the physical body. The Self lives in that body after “death” on earth. But wherever there is a “body,” there must be “death”, whether after three score and 12 years or three score and 12 yugas. The Ignorance therefore is the seed of Samsāra. This must be removed. Hence the necessity of this Brahma enquiry

कर्मविषये च अनुक्तिः तद्विरोधित्वात् ॥

It is no portion of Karma-kānda. this enquiry is in fact, incongruous with it; nor do Karmas deal with Ātmā, they deal with Its various sheaths or vehicles; the forms with the modified life, and not with the Pure Self. In fact, the proper knowledge of Ātman is obstructed by Karmas, nay, such knowledge is opposed to Karmas. He who has been anointed as a sovereign over all, can never bow to another; he who has realised Brahman, will never, thereafter, bow down to any lower divinities, because he has become the inmost Self of all Devas; all Powers and Hierarchies. He therefore cannot perform any karmas in the shape of sacrifices to these Devas. The Illumined, the Enlightened, “Brahma-I-am” is incapable of Karma. For he has no motive left; and no actions are performed without some motive. Therefore, Wisdom is opposed to Action. The question propounded therefore in this Upaniṣad does not relate to Karma, but to Jñāna.

Karmas not unnecessary :—

If Jñāna be the highest end, why should we perform Karmas? why should we not all renounce Karmas? This is a danger which all must guard against. The danger is so subtle, on so high a plane, that it eludes the vision of the keenest thinkers, and there have been cases of Brahma-vettās who went

to Nirvāna too early. The great Ācharya, therefore, guards his pupils against this danger, in these two short aphorisms :—

कर्मानारम्भ इति चेत् ॥ न ॥ निष्कामस्य संकारार्थत्वात् ॥

The Niskāma actions, altruistic actions should never be renounced, for they “refine”. Refine what? Not the Ātmā—for it is simplicity and purity itself. The “refinement” therefore is of the vehicles, of the various Kosas in which the Ātmā functions. The Niskāma karmas fulfil the purpose of Evolution—spiritualising matter, making it a better vehicle of spirit for future ages, and Kalpas. But do not all Karmas soil the soul? Is it not better to avoid the mind from the first, than to wash one’s self after wallowing in it? All Karmas are transitory in their fruit, and requiring much exertion in their performance—better never perform them at all? True. But all this applies to Sakāma Karmas—actions performed with some personal desire or motive. Those “selfish” actions only taint. But not the Niskāma Karmas—altruistic actions. They are “refining” influence, promoting evolution; and to perform such Karmas, to be a beneficent force on the side of evolution, to be a Helper, one must study the mystery of Prāṇa and its correlations—the one Force whose various modifications are all the forces of the physical and super-physical nature. Hence the first eight chapters of this Talavakāra Brāhmaṇa taught the Prāṇa—Vidyā. It is “Practical Occultism”, which only a “Brāhman” may study. The “Upanisad” however in its intellectual aspect at least, may be studied by all, though this also will not reveal its inner-most meaning but to a “Brāhman”. Therefore Karmas must be performed, for it is through the Great-Sacrifices and Sacrifices that the body is made a “Brāhman-body”—a fit vehicle for the manifestation of Higher forces, a well-tuned instrument for the use of the Lords. “Sacrifice, gift and also austerity are the purifiers of the intelligent”—says the Gītā. So also with the Occultism of Prāṇa-Vidyā. It may be studied theoretically or practically—but in whatever way it may be studied, if it is used with the slightest tinge of Kāma or personal Desire, it becomes “Black Magic” and taints the soul. Such an Upāsaka of Prāṇa cannot rise higher than the sphere of Prāṇa—his highest end is Union or identity with Prāṇa. It is “Black Magic”—though not in the bad sense of the word. For anything that does not conduce to Mukti is “Black”. But that very Prāṇa-Vidyā in the hands of a perfectly unselfish Niskāma person produces higher results,—it removes the obstacles to Ātma-knowledge—as the rubbing of a mirror clears the surface and makes it reflect better. For a person who has attained self-knowledge or to be more accurate, he who has realised the self—in whom the Self has arisen—for such a person Karmas need not be performed—for no object may be gained now thereby. By Karma the Jīva is bound, by knowledge he becomes free, therefore the controlled Ones who have seen the goal do not perform Karmas. No more does the sailor drag the boat after him on the land when he has crossed the river. For it is then an obstacle to his further progress rather than a help.

स्वभावसिद्धिश्चात्मा तथा न आपिर्पायितः ॥

The Ātmā moreover can never be the object of any Karmas. All actions produce four sorts of effects—1. Production—Utpatti, some new combination is made, something new is produced. 2. Attainment,—Āpti, something is reached which was distant before, i.e., change of position. 3. Destruction—Vikṛiti

breaking up a form. 4 Refining—Sanskṛiti or polishing an object. In other words, the effect of all actions in relation to any object must fall under one of the above four heads, it either rearranges the materials to form new object, or it changes the relative distance between two objects bringing them closer together. Lastly it either modifies an object for the worse or better. This is the general theory regarding Karma in its widest sense. But even taking the Karma in its most limited sense, namely sacrificial and ritualistic actions, their effect is also fourfold as above mentioned.

The state of Mukti :—

Now none of these four effects affect the Âtmā or the state of Mukti. Had Mukti or Kaivalya been the state of producing in the Self the quality of extreme bliss, or had it been the condition of attuning by the Jīva a God dwelling outside of cosmos, such a state of Kaivalya would be a temporary one. The popular idea, therefore, of Mukti, that it is the production, in the soul, of the feeling of intense ecstasy by Yogic and other processes, or the reaching of a Heaven where dwells one's Beloved God is fallacious, though true. A state of intense bliss is experienced when Ânandamayā Kośa is touched, but it is the sheath and not the Self. "God" is also attained in Heaven by the devotee of every religion, the Hindu, with his Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, or Maheshvara, the Christian with his Christ and the Mohammedan with his Allah, but that is not Kaivalya, the real Mukti. It is transitory after all, though æonic in its duration. The Âtmā is. It is not a thing to be produced, for it is a Simple Substance, a स्वभाव सिद्धः perfect in its essence, no operation can make it better. Nor can it be reached, for it is itself the thing that reaches, no one can reach his own self, nor does any one ever wish to reach himself. Being the Self it is Eternal, always reached. Nor is it subject to modification—for It is Eternal, Simple, non-material, formless. It increases not by Karma. Nor can it be refined, for it is Pure, untainted by sin. Moreover there is nothing else than Âtmā. To refine there must be two things—the refiner and the refined. There can be no action outside the Âtmā nor is it possible to refine the Self by the Self. The Âtmā is therefore above the four-fold Karma effects.

A person, therefore who has fully realised the absolute uselessness of all Karmas, so far as Self is concerned, who has enjoyed to satiation over and over again the "eternal" pleasures of Svarga, and who therefore no longer desires it, such a person being a true Adhikāri, one whose soul-current has turned from all things external, on whatever planes they may be, towards the Self, such a person puts this question "By whom ordained does the mind go towards its object &c?"—Manas, Prāṇa &c. are insentient, "jada" in themselves: It is through and owing to the proximity of the Âtmā that they have their power—as the burning power of a red-hot ball of iron is due to the "fire" in it, and not to the "iron". The "nimitta" or the efficient cause is the Âtmā, the only "Clut" or consciousness, or Self-luminous.

But the pervasion of fire in the ball of iron or of heat in water is perceptible. This shows us in that way by differentiation the pervasion of the Self in Manas, Prāṇa, Senses &c. To this we reply that the Self is not an object of perception, nor of mental conception, we cannot show It to you, for the eye does not go there, we cannot explain it to you, for it is unwordable. It is different from the known, it is above the Unknown. For verily the knower itself is indeed

the "It", for Âtman is the Self of all. So in the case of Âtman, there can be no such division as the "Knower" and the "Known"—there being no such distinction, it is separate from the "known". For He knows all, there is no knower of Him. How can the knower be known. Moreover, that which is "known" must be an "object" in order to be known. It must become limited in order to be comprehended, it must be conditioned by Time and Space, it must become many, in short it must become complex. But the Âtman is unlimited, is unconditioned by Time and Space, is the only Unity, and Simple.

Is Âtmâ then totally unknown? No. A thing that is unknown, that becomes an object of search, of enquiry. People always try to increase their scope of knowledge by removing the circle of ignorance further and further. All "unknown" depend upon vijñāna, there is always an expectation of knowing it some day. But the Âtman is not vijñāna-apekṣa, *i.e.*, knowledge-related unknown—for It is knowledge Itself. The flame of the lamp does not require the flame of another lamp to make its form visible to itself. The Âtmâ being knowledge, does not require some other knowledge to make itself known to Itself.

How do you explain then the phrases and Śrūtis like this?—"I do not know the Âtmâ". Then art That," "known the Âtmâ above Âtmâ knowing they became Immortal" &c.? Do not these Śrūtis show that there is the need of a higher knowledge to know the Âtmâ? Not necessarily. "I do not know the Âtmâ"—is the utterance of the lower self—the self identifying itself with its vehicles Buddhi &c, the non-discriminating self—the "delusive" Self—the Self whose knowledge is limited, and conditioned. Moreover the Âtmâ meant here is not the real Âtmâ but some conditioned phase of it. The Śruti teachings also refer to the removal of false notions about the Âtman. The Âtmâ is above the known and the unknown, the substrate of all perceptions and conceptions, implicitly taken for granted in every act of sensation. For the force that causes sensation, that carries sensation and that perceives it, analyses, classifies and reasons over it—is one, the various aspects of Âtmâ.

In fact, Brahm is not only behind all knowing, feeling and willing of the Jīva, It is behind every physical and superphysical phenomenon. All that one can learn by studying the contents of one's own consciousness is but little compared with the infinity of Brahm. No one therefore can say "I know Brahm well". All that he can properly say is—"I know It not, but I know It." The enquirer who has realised that Brahm is unknown and unknowable, because It is not an object, and because It is one's own Self—the knower, he has really known Brahm, and has become enlightened: and has seen the Truth. But he who thinks he has known Brahm, is really deluded; and is far from the Truth.

Pratibodha. First Meaning :—

All our perceptions and conceptions though taking place in the vehicles of Manas and Buddhi are revealers of Brahm. For it is to be known in every act of perception and thinking: as fire may be seen in the iron ball when red hot. Similarly though Manas and Buddhi are insentient, yet when they function, when they glow with thought—they reveal Brahm; the glow is Brahm. They

become the doors, the cracks through which the Sun of Truth reveals His presence. The Brahm may thus be known as the Pratyagâtman—the light that illumines the Jiva and when such a knowledge is gained, immortality is attained. In other words, one realises that he always was, is and will be immortal and that it was a glamour that made him think that he was mortal. The knowledge of Brahm does not produce immortality. For if Immortality be a product, dependent upon knowledge it would be non-eternal, a fictitious immortality, and not a real immortality. For being an effect, it must be in its very nature transitory. The Immortality, therefore, is not the product of Vidyâ or Self-knowledge.*

If immortality be the essential nature of the Self, what is the necessity of acquiring Self-knowledge? The knowledge removes the false notion that one is mortal and transitory, it makes manifest the true eternal inherent Immortality of the Self by removing the false, beginningless accidental ignorance that one is mortal—and it is in this sense alone that Vidyâ is said to be the giver of Immortality in verse 12. For it is Vidyâ that gives the power to destroy this thick and dense gloom of Self-delusion. For in every plane Knowledge is Power—as an elephant bulk has more strength than man, but man through his knowledge is more powerful than the elephant.

Pratibodha. Second meaning:—

This Self-knowledge is like pratibodha—awakening from sleep and realising that the whole world was a dream—self-evolved and self-imposed, having no independent existence of its own.

This Self-knowledge is obtained from a real Guru—the Pratibodha or illumination which one gets when initiated by a Guru, it is then that the nature of the selves and the Self is for the first time revealed and the man knows from his Master his greatness.

If a man therefore realises this truth in this life, it is good for him, but if he fails to do so, not only his life is useless, but he must pass through the miseries of re-incarnation. Therefore the wise realise the Self in all beings, desist from all external objects and desires, renounce all idea of identity with the vehicles and Koṣas, rise above Aham-kâra (i-ness,) and become Immortal.

So far then the Upaniṣad as far as Brahma-vidyâ is concerned. The last half is a story illustrating the nature of Brahm, and how difficult It is of realisation.

शमयर्थो वाग्नायोऽभिमान शतनात् ॥

It shows the means by which Self-knowledge may be obtained, i. e., by removing one's own Self conceit, by removing the false notion that one is really free agent, has any power of his own except that given to him by Brahm.

So long as one is moved by passions and pride and prejudice, Self-knowledge is far from him. When Indra, Vâyn and Agni lost their (abhimâna) pride, then they came to know Him.

सगुणोपासनार्थो बाष्पोदितत्वात् ॥

* Compare Goethe —“It is to a thinking being quite impossible to think himself non-existent, ceasing to think and live, so far does every one carry in himself the proof of immortality, and quite spontaneously. But so soon as the man will be objective and go out of himself, so soon as he dogmatically will grasp a personal duration to bolster up in cockney fashion that inward assurance he is lost in contradiction.” ‘Emerson on Immortality.

The story further teaches the necessity of worshipping Saguna-Brahm. In the first half of the Upaniṣad it was repeatedly asserted "Brahm is not that which the people here adore" A partial understanding of that well-known verse is calculated to mislead one to think that Pūjās and prayers are useless. No greater mistake could be made Brahman is not only Transcendental Self, but the All-Beloved—the Tad-vana, the most dear object of love and adoration for all beings, human or divine. Brahman must be worshipped and meditated upon as an Over-God and Over-Soul.

ब्रह्मेति परो लिङ्गात् ॥

The third object served by this story is to teach that Brahman is the Parama-Īśvara also—the God Supreme. It asserts the existence of Īśvara, for none but the Īśvara could make a straw hard and incombustible, heavy and unshakable. The will of Īśvara can make a straw hard as an adamant. But how is the existence of such a Personal God proved ?

तत्सिद्धिर्जगतोनियत प्रवृत्तेः ॥

The existence of God is proved by the orderly manifestation and course of evolution of the universe. The whole universe, in all its planes, gross and subtle, all creatures, Devas, Gandharvas, Yaksas, Rākṣasas, Pitṛiḥ, Piśāchās, all worlds, physical, Astral and Heaven worlds* suns, moons, and planets, all this diversity of nature is not a chaos, a confusion, but a well-regulated cosmos and proves itself to be the work of a being all-wise to plan and all-powerful to execute. All creatures enjoy the due reward of their good deeds, and suffer the evil consequences of their bad deeds ; and the whole ethical, as well as the physical, nature is linked in a wonderful chain of causation †

कर्मण एवेति चेत् ॥ न ॥ परतन्त्रस्य निमित्तमावत्त्वात् ॥

The Karmas alone cannot produce this universe—they are insentient and dependant and are mere occasions ‡ The Administrator of the law is always different from the law. If it be said that there is an inherent power in the Karmas to produce their own effect, that is also not reasonable. For Karmas are always produced by sentient beings, and as soon as the sentient force behind the Karmas is withdrawn, they cease to operate. How can then they produce any effect after a lapse of time and in a distant place from their seat of origin.

* Fit habitations and places of enjoyment for creatures of various kinds

† It must be the work of a Being who knows all other beings and their Karmas, so as to award them fruits fitted for particular time, place and cause. For though there is diversity in the universe, it does not show that there are more than one Īśvara but the very fact of the harmony in this diversity shows that it is the product of One Mind who has arranged the different parts in their due order.

‡ That the diversity in the universe depends upon the Karmas of the Jivas is admitted by both those who believe in the existence of Īśvara and those who do not, like the Sāṅkhyas. The Jivas suffer and enjoy because of their Karmas, otherwise the Īśvara, would be an arbitrary and cruel Being, or if there be no Īśvara, if the people do not suffer owing to their Karmas, then the nature would be a chaos—and the Moral world the only sphere above Law

कर्त्तव्यप्रयोजक इति चेत् ॥ न ॥ देशकाल निमित्तविशेषानाभिज्ञत्वात् ॥

If it be said that the originator of the Karma is also its administrator in the next life : that is not also conclusive. For the Karma-producer himself generally does not know all the consequences of his Karmas. Nor does any man punish himself; he would not elect those Karmas to manifest which would give him pain (अनिष्टफलस्याप्रयोजना स्यात्) but only such as would be pleasant. Who is then to produce the effect of evil Karmas ? §

भूताश्रयमिति चेत् ॥ न ॥ साधनत्वात् ॥

If it be urged that Karmas inhere in the atoms of the vehicles used by the Jīva in his past life, and that those atoms go to form 'of themselves' the new vehicles of the re-incarnating Ego, that is also not plausible. The atoms are merely the instruments used by Ego; they manifest their force so long as used by the Ego: they are quiescent when not so used. As a plough may be used by a husbandman, but when discarded by him it does not rise to meet his grasp when he comes to the field the next day, nor does the plough of itself carry the harvest home. If it be said that Karmas are self-moving like the air, that is also wrong. For air is not self-moving, otherwise it would move one's chariot of its own accord.

शस्त्रात् कर्मण एवेति चेत् ॥ न ॥ इष्टन्याय हानानुपपत्तेः ॥

The followers of Jaimini maintain that the Śāstras declare that the Karmas alone produce their result without the intermediation of an unnecessary factor, Īśvara. They refer to texts like these: "Let him perform sacrifice, if he desires heaven" Here attainment of Heaven is the direct result of the performance of sacrifice. The scriptures do not say that he would be led to Heaven by Īśvara; but sacrifice produces as its inevitable result Heaven. So the Śāstras do not prove Īśvara.

To this we answer, It is not so. All actions are of two sorts. 1. Those whose effects or fruits are visible, perceptible (Dṛṣṭa-phala). 2. Those whose effects are not so apparent (Adṛṣṭa-phalā). The first class is again sub-divided into two—(a) Immediate fruition (Anantara-phalā). (b) Future fruition (Āgāmi phalā). The immediate fructifying acts are like going, eating, &c. They produce their effect instantaneously. A man feels hungry. He eats. The hunger is satisfied. He wants to go to a particular place. He starts—and the place is reached. Other actions require "Time" as an element in the production of their fruit, or require the introduction of some other factor to produce the result. They are actions like agriculture, service, &c. When the husbandman sows the seed, the tree does not sprout up at once and give him fruit. He must wait for the proper season. When one serves a master, he does not get the reward at once. He must wait for the proper time and pleasure of the master.

In none of the above examples do we see Karmas producing their effect without the intervention of a sentient being. Now the Adṛṣṭa Karmas are analogous to the Karmas of service. When a sacrifice is performed, it is so

§ Nor do Karmas produce *Suo motu* their effect on a person, whether he wills it or not. It cannot be said that the Karmas are attracted to the Ego, as the magnet attracts iron without the exercise of any volition on the part of the Ego for no such elective affinity between the Karmas and the ego is demonstrated.

much service rendered to Íśvara and He rewards the performer in Heaven, as an earthly master rewards his servant. For Íśvara knows the doer of the Karma, the Karma itself, and what is the fruit of it, and he allots it accordingly.

If Íśvara allots the fruits of Karmas of Jivas, who allots the fruits of Íśvara's Karmas? There is no one Higher than Íśvara, and as a matter of the Highest Truth, the Íśvara is the Self of all—the apparent separation of the Ruler and the ruled is fictitious, not transcendently real. Being the Self of all, it is the Self that punishes or rewards the self really.

If Íśvara be like a king, he will be partial, showing favor to some, and disfavor to others. He will have likings, and dislikings, and will be like an ordinary human being. No. He is merely the witness of the actions of men. In allotting the fruits of actions, He is not swayed by any personal motive—but like a judge he passes the sentence proper in each case. He gives that which one deserves, nothing more nor less. He is moreover the Eternal witness, whose nature is Eternal knowledge. He is not like a human witness who must see in order to bear testimony. As His knowledge is Eternal, there is no fear of malobservation or wrong observation in his case.

If Íśvara is the Self of all Jivas, He must be tinged with the good and bad actions of men: and must become a Sasmâri Jiva. No. The scriptures emphatically declare that he is not tainted by the sins of man. "As the one sun the eye of whole world is not sullied by the defects of the eye or of external things, so He, as the Inner Soul of all beings is not sullied by the happiness or unhappiness of the world" (Kāth V. 11). "Free from decay, free from death, He transcends decay and death." His desire is true, His thought is true. This is the Lord of All. He makes men do virtuous work. "Unceasing the other mere watches." These and various other Śrutis all declare that Íśvara is above Saṃsāra (world-chain) eternally free, untainted by action, though awarding the fruit of actions to all.

न चार्थवादः शुश्रूषन्ते कल्पयितुं अन्वययोगित्वे सति विश्वानोत्पादकत्वात् ॥

Are not all those texts about Íśvara mere Artha-vādas, mere laudatory passages, not to be taken in their literal sense? These texts do not declare any rule of action, any law, and therefore must be mere artha-vādas, descriptive sayings. No. These texts produce a knowledge of Brahman and Ātmā, and have therefore rather a different sphere of application than the texts enjoining Karmas. They declare the truth of the matter which they describe—and the rule of interpretation of mandatory texts should not be applied to declaratory texts. The fact that they are declaratory (artha-vāda) does not lessen their prohibitive force. They are not declarations to which there are exceptions, or which are annulled by some higher declaration. They are not like Karma-kāṇḍa declarations where a special overrules a general, such as the general declaration not to injure any creature (a-himsā) is set aside by the permissive declaration of killing animals in sacrifice.

अप्रतिषेधात् च ॥

Moreover, there are no passages which declare that Íśvara is not. There are passages which declare that the earth and all that exists therein have a

phenomenal existence only, but really they are not. But there are no passages which declare that Īśvara is a phenomenon only and has no real existence. Texts like these : "Brahm has two forms," visible (mūrta) and invisible (amūrta) &c. are certainly descriptive, for they have been set aside by the higher texts like "नेति नेति" "not this, not this"—but there is no such prohibitory passage with regard to Īśvara.

An objection :—

Prohibition can be of that only which a man naturally does or knows. Thus it is natural for men to kill lower animals and injure others ; therefore there was necessity of the prohibitive injunction. "Do not injure any being." But it is not natural for men to know God, so there was no necessity of an explicit declaration in the Śāstras to the effect that "there is no God."

प्राप्ति अभावात् इति चेत् । न । उक्तत्वात् ॥

There is no force in this objection. For the idea of God is a naturally implanted idea in the hearts of all men. Man is naturally inclined to worship, as he is naturally inclined to kill. Therefore it was necessary for the Śāstra to declare whether this natural tendency of the whole humanity was a true tendency or a wrong tendency.

Similarly there was no text which declares that Īśvara does not award the fruits of actions. It is not usual to mention all the concomitant causes that go to produce an effect. Time and Space are as much necessary for the production of an effect as the immediate cause. "Sacrifice is the cause of Heaven." This is true, but partially true. It declares that sacrifice has the power of leading one to heaven. But it omits, as unnecessary, the mention of concomitant causes, like the Time, Space and Īśvara, &c.—all of which contribute towards the production of the desired effect—"Heaven."

The substance which invariably precedes immediately another thing is said to be the cause of that thing. Now the sacrifice does not immediately precede Heaven—there is always a great lapse of time between the sacrifice and the attainment of heaven. The sacrifice comes to an end with its performance. It remains as a cause in the sense of a modification (saṃskāra) in the consciousness of Īśvara, as the doing of a service remains as a Saṃskāra (modification or idea) in the consciousness of the master, when the time comes to award wages to the servant. Therefore Īśvara is the immediate cause of the fruition of action—neither the doer nor the act (of sacrifice) being such cause.

जीव ईश्वराद् भिन्नः तद् विरुद्धधर्माक्रान्तत्वात् सत्त्वगमेदोश्च महिषवत् ॥

The jīva or the personal Self is separate from Īśvara ; as the *natures* of these two are diametrically different and their attributes or external marks are also different, as different as those of a horse and buffalo, for a clod of earth is not a nugget of gold. The Īśvara is Omniscient, the Jīva is of little knowledge ; One is all-powerful, the other is weak ; the one is above all Karman,

the other is bound by Karmas ; the One is the Adored, the other is the adorer ; the one is Pure, the other is impure, the One is Free, the other is bound ; God and man are, therefore, separate.

ज्ञानं शक्तिं कर्म-उपस्थं उपासक-शुद्ध-अशुद्ध-मुक्त-अमुक्त-भेदाद् आत्मभेद एवेति चेत् ॥

The Īśvara is Omniscient. His knowledge of everything is eternal and unvarying—like the light of the sun ; on the contrary, the Jīvas are of little knowledge, their light is like that of a glow-worm. The difference in power is equally great—the Īśvara is all-mighty and omnipotent, the Jīvas are weak and of small power. The difference in their Karmas or activities is also great. The Īśvara is like a king or a magnet or a light, who remaining Himself unmodified and karma-less, induces actions in others—as the mere will of the king sends its officials running to all directions, or the magnet induces current in the iron, without changing its own nature, or a light causes all things visible and gives birth to various other lights without any diminution of its own power. So the Karma of Īśvara is that of Pure Intelligence, occasioned by the contiguity of Ātmā substance (Spirit) ; as the act of burning of the Fire is occasioned by the contiguity of dravya-sattā (Matter), for the nature of Fire is to heat. Not so the Karmas of the Jīvas, for their Karmas modify the nature of the Jīvas ; their vehicles are tainted thereby, either towards perfection or degradation. The Īśvara moreover is the object of worship, meditation and adoration like unto a Guru or a king. The Jīvas, on the other hand, are worshippers, and adorers as servants and disciples. The Īśvara is eternally pure, untouched by sin ; the Jīvas, on the contrary, are sinful, for they go to heaven or hell according to their good or bad deeds. The Īśvara is thus eternally-free, the Jīvas eternally dependent. Therefore God and Man are different.

Moreover wherever there are differences of marks or attributes, the things are different, as a horse and a buffalo.

न । भेदद्वि-अपवादात् ॥

This view that the Īśvara and the Jīvas are different is not true, and is opposed to all Śruti texts. "He does not know who thinks 'I am another he is another'—there is the Perishable World" (Chhând VII 25-2). "From death he goes to death who sees many here" (Kath IV-11) These declare the terrible consequences of seeing difference. Moreover there are thousands of texts declaring the unity of the Īśvara and the Jīvas.

न । अम्युपगमात् ॥

As regards the difference between the knowledge, power, Karma &c. of the Īśvara and the Jīvas, we reply, that 'really' we do not see any such difference, as you allege. First let us settle as to what we mean by the word Jīva. (1) Either it means an entity possessed of 'Buddhi, Manas,' &c, whose inherent qualities are Buddhi, Manas &c and which reflects intelligence. (2) Or 'bodies' endowed with intelligence, known by the names of "Man", "Devas" &c. (3) Or 'Pure Intelligence, apart from all vehicles.

Now as regards the first case, there are no *Âtmâs*, that are independent and apart from *Buddhi* &c and separate in attribute from the *Îśvara*. For there are not many *Âtmâs*, but One *Îśvara* alone eternally free is the *Âtmâ* of all creatures. The *Âtmâs* that appear to be separate in attribute from *Îśvara*, and to have limited intelligence &c are merely fictitious and imaginary. *Buddhi*, *manas* &c are not the inherent, invariable attributes of the *Âtmâs*. They are only accidental adjuncts of *Âtmâ*-Perception and sensation, ignorance and knowledge, subtle and subtler bodies are all accidents—the *Âtmâ* is a reflection of eternal knowledge, the *Îśvara* is Its utmost core, it is really eternally pure, intelligent, free and knowing, but accidentally conjoined with *Buddhi* &c, with *my*ness, *thy*ness and a thousand other contradictory and conflicting thoughts, ideas, and notions. In fact *Buddhi* &c cannot be the *natural* attributes of *Âtmâ*; for it is its connection, non-separateness with these that makes It a *Samsâri*—a worldly *Jîva*, subject to births and deaths. It is its separateness from these that is called *mokṣa* or liberation.

Nor is body *Âtmâ*. For it is visibly material and subject to destruction—for the bodies of Men, *Pitris* and *Devas*—physical, astral or mental bodies—all are seen to disintegrate. So the bodies cannot be the *Âtmâ*, for it is the common ground between us that *Âtmâ* never disintegrate. The *Jîva* is therefore essentially Pure Intelligence apart from all *upâdhis* or vehicles, and as such, there are no distinguishing or differentiating attributes between the *Jîva* and the *Îśvara*. The apparent differences in *Buddhi* &c, are *upâdhi*-caused differences—accidental difference, not an essential difference. In fact, there is no other *Âtmâ* than the *Îśvara*; and He is the *Jîva* in all *Upâdhis*, and as such is called the individual *Âtmâ* of that *upâdhi*.

ईश्वरस्यैव सुखदुःखादि योगः ॥

If *Îśvara* is the *Âtmâ* in all *upâdhis*, then He becomes subject to bondage and freedom, pleasure and pain, &c. How do you reconcile this with the view that the *Îśvara* is eternally free, pure, &c.

न । निमित्तत्वे सति लोक विपर्ययाध्यारोपणान्, सवितृवत् ॥

It is not so. The whole *Samsâra* is merely an imagination, an illusion. The *Îśvara* is merely a *Nimitta* or efficient cause, the differences and contradictions are due to the super-imposition of men as in the case of the sun. The sun is eternally fixed, it neither rises nor sets; but he is said to cause light and darkness, through human ignorance. The rising and setting of the sun is due not to the eternally unchanging sun, but to the change in the attitude and position of the perceiver with regard to the sun. Men have super-imposed on the sun their own changefulness, and call him the cause of day and night. So is the case with *Îśvara*. He is All-knowledge and All power—but owing to the shifting nature of the *Antah-karṇa* (Inner-organ), like unto the revolving earth the eternal *Îśvara* appears now as knowledge, now as ignorance, now as powerful, now as without power, now as happy, now as miserable. But when the *Antah-karṇa* is fixed and steadied, purified and cleansed, the reflected light also becomes steady and clear, instead of dim and distorted, and the picture in the *Antah-karṇa* becomes a complete and perfect miniature of the central sun.

आत्महृदि-अनुरूपग्रन्थारोपात् च ॥

Moreover all super-impositions are subjective, dependent on the particular point of view of the observer. Thus a person observing the sun in a place over which there are clouds hanging, says "the sun is not shining"—so also men attribute the imperfections of their own surroundings and natures to *Īśvara*. The sun is always shining, it is the cloud that has cut off the rays from the eyes of the observer, but instead of attributing the darkness to its true cause, the ignorant man says, "the sun is not shining." Similarly the mental clouds, the modifications and changes constantly going on in the perceptive vehicles, cause the illusion of the *Ātmā* suffering and enjoying, knowing and forgetting &c.

Thus the *Īśvara* is both *Samsāri* and not *Samsāri*, bound and free. He is *Samsāri* to the vision of persons suffering from the super-imposition of ignorance; He is not *Samsāri* to the wise; He is bound to the ignorant, He is free to the wise. Ordinary people will always think themselves subject to pleasure and pain, will always identify themselves with their vehicles, physical, astral or mental, the enlightened rise above these illusions—they also suffer pleasure and pain, but attribute them to their true cause—the vehicles.

Thus there is not 'essential' difference between the *Īśvara* and the *Jīva*, between the God and the Man. There is no distinction between the Intelligence of *Īśvara* and the Intelligence of *Jīva*, as Intelligence, between their subtleness, all-pervasiveness, &c

विक्रियाद्यदे च अनित्यत्वात् मोक्षे च विशेष-अनभ्युपगमात् ॥

Admitting that there is no difference in the 'essence,' but some men are happy, some are miserable, some are strong, some are weak, some intelligent, others ignorant: and as this difference between man and man is eternal, the vehicles are eternally different, and this 'essential' difference in the vehicles of men, separates man from God essentially. To this, our reply is clear. In manifestation, the difference of vehicles is "eternal," but this difference ceases in *mokṣa*, for no difference between man and man is perceptible in *mokṣa*. In that state all are equal, without any distinctions to mark one *Jīva* from another. For happiness &c., being in the nature of the *upādhi* and not of the *Ātmā*, the *Ātmās* are all equal. Moreover all are agreed that in *Mokṣa*, no differences exist.

स्वरूप अवस्थानं मोक्षः ॥

For *Mokṣa* means to remain unmodified in one's own essential nature; therefore these differences of pleasure and pain &c., are accidental to mankind and not essential.

अभ्युपगमे च, अनित्य प्रसंगात् ॥

But why should Mokṣa be a state of such dull monotony where all are equal in power, wisdom and goodness, where all look alike. Such a condition would be the dullest imaginable. Not at all. For logically a state of Mokṣa is unimaginable where there should exist differences; for then it would also be transitory and impermanent: for difference implies change, and whatever changeth is not eternal. Nor need Mokṣa be a dull state—it is a state where every one has every thing—where all that exists, all that ever existed and all that will come into existence in future are the heritage of the Mukta—where the eternity behind, the eternity before, the eternity in the present, are all summed up in One eternity; if such a state be a dull state, then ecstacy and bliss are dull.

Moreover in every-day-life 'it is seen that the differences are due to avidyā or ignorance—for the differences perceived in the waking and the dream states all vanish in the *Susupti* (dreamless sleep) and the *Samādhi* states. The differences therefore are merely accidental, impermanent, and consequently not real, and therefore false.

The Mokṣa of the *Âtmā* is a term which denotes the separation and falling off of the seed of ignorance through the true and proper understanding of the nature of self. It is the realisation that this seed of ignorance is the product of the contract of *Ahankāra* (I-ness) with the eternal germ of vehicle-activities—the activities of the dense, astral and mental bodies. In other words, the vibrations of the vehicles giving rise to sensations, perceptions and conceptions, plus the notion of I-ness in them is the ignorance-seed. The destruction of this seed consists in the separation of this I-ness from the vehicles, and raising it to the true I.

Bondage and liberation—*Bandha* and *Mokṣa*—are therefore relative terms. It is the state of *Jīva* (*Svāûpa*) in its two different states. one union with *avidyā*, and other disunion from it. *Mokṣa* is therefore not necessarily the falling off of the vehicles, it is the realisation of their not I-ness; and understanding that the affections are of the *upādhis* (vehicles) and not of the *Âtmā*.

Therefore the unity is proved.

RĀMANUJA SCHOOL.

The essence and nature of the Supreme self is described in this Upaniṣad in the form of questions and answers. By whom directed the mind goes towards its object, the object that it desires, over which it thinks, on which it clings and towards which it naturally gravitates (Patati-falls). Among the various Prāṇas, by whose command does the Supreme Prāṇa, the first Prāṇa perform its functions and pervade the world? By whom directed do people utter speech? Who is the director of eye and ear? All these are insentient in themselves and so cannot originate any action of themselves. So that pupil asks the teacher: tell me what is that sentient force which is behind these psychological and physiological phenomena—which directs and controls them.

The teacher replies "He who is the ear of the ear, mind of the mind, speech of speech, He indeed is Life of Prāṇa itself, He is eye of eye. Knowing Him, the wise after death leaving this world obtain immortality, through the Path of Light, &c. The eye goeth not there, nor mind. How can then that be taught. It should be taught by saying "we know it not, we understand it not. Let him teach (anuśīyāt) by saying we know it not by the inner organ (mind), we understand it not by our external senses—It is not to be known by Inner senses or External senses.

4-9. If It cannot be known by any self, if It cannot be an object of knowledge, then It is either too high for us or too insignificant, where is then the necessity of making enquiry about Brahm or searching a Guru. To this the Śruti replies,—the former teachers who taught us Brahm told us that It is different from all that is known to all beings, as well as from all that is unknown to them. That which cannot be manifested by speech, who is the cause of the manifestation of the organ of speech, know that as Brahm, and not that which the people adore as "this." Whatever can be pointed out or defined by using the word *idam* "this" that is not Brahma; whatever the masses of mankind worship as God and all such participate of the nature of *idam*—"this" something very well known like a plum in one's hand—nothing of that is Brahm. No mental form is Brahm, nor is it any visible, audible or sensible form,

The teacher again says.—If thou thinkest "I have understood now fully the nature of Brahm—it is misconception. For the aspect of Brahm manifested in this world and known to thee is but a small portion of Him; that aspect of Him which is manifested in the Devas and which thou thinkest thou knowest that is also a minor manifestation of Brahm. Thou hast not yet known the full manifestation of Brahma in all its aspects. Therefore thou must meditate again—thou hast not yet fully understood it.

The pupil having meditated and thought over it, again says—"I think I now understand."

10. How? To it the pupil replies—I do not think I know It fully, nor do I think I know it not at all—verily I know this Reality. It is unknowable in its totality, but It is partly knowable. Amongst us Brahma-students he who knows "I know It not; I know It"—he who knows it in this dual

assertion of knowledge and non-knowledge, he verily knows. The true Brahman-knower will never assert वेदं "I know"; nor will he assert नो न वेद "I do not know"—but he says "no na veda—veda cha"—"I do not know It, yet I know It". He verily understands Brahm who has understood the significance of this formula "no na veda, veda cha."

11 He who does not think Brahm as limited and defined, he has really thought out or understood Brahm. He who thinks Brahm as limited and defined, he does not know It. Brahm is unknown to those who know "thus much is Brahm"—who know It by defining It. But Brahm becomes known to them who are devoid of this "discriminating" "defining" knowledge. The words "vijānatām" and "avijānatām" must be explained in the above light. They are "vijānantaḥ" who "discriminating" know, *i. e.*, who try to know by definitions and distinctions, *i. e.*, who try to understand it by mind, the analytic and synthetic faculty. They cannot understand Brahm. But those who are "avijānantaḥ"—who have transcended definitions and distinctions, they know it. The vijānantaḥ are those who say we 'know fully—but Brahm can not be known fully by any being: while avijānantaḥ are those who say "we do not 'fully' know" and in so saying they have caught an aspect of the reality.

12 When properly understood, Brahm gives immortality. "Proper understanding—Pratibodha" consists in understanding it as truth, knowledge, Infinity &c,—to understand Its transcendental attributes. Through the grace, of the self (ātmanā) is obtained "power"—the faculty of gaining right knowledge. Through knowledge thus obtained by the power of gaining true knowledge given by the Supreme self, the soul enjoys immortality.

13 If Brahm is known in this very life, then the soul attains the state of the Sat, which is called the Satya. But if one does not know Brahm in this life, he remains असत् "devoid of sat hood"—the faculty of sat does not manifest in him. Those wise ones who see Brahm in all objects, but yet who realise It as different from themselves and all objects—they attain the supreme self, by the path of light &c, and become free.

14 To illustrate this teaching, to show the inmost nature of this great reality, which one is apt to ignore by the very fact of its being so near to us, the Śruti relates a story

Once in the war between the Devas and the Asuras, the Devas got victory—of course because the great reality Brahm had ordained it so. Because He through the Devas had obtained victory for the Devas, then the

Devas were honored over the Asuras. But the Devas did not understand it, they thought "ours is the victory, ours is the Glory We have conquered the asuras."

15 Brahm found out the conceit of the Devas. In order to correct them, He manifested Himself as a Yakṣa. The Devas could not find out who was this Yakṣa.

They then asked Agni to go and find out who was this Yakṣa. Agni went towards the Yakṣa. The Yakṣa asked him, who art thou. Agni replied—"I am Agni, I am Jāta-veda These are my two well-known names." "What is thy power—what canst thou do"—asked the Yakṣa "I can burn up all that is on earth" replied Agni. He put a straw before Agni and said "burn" Agni went to it quickly, exerted all his might, but could not burn the straw. He returned abashed to the Devas and said "I could not find out this Yakṣa."

Then Vāyu was deputed to find out the Yakṣa: but he also returned with his pride lowered.

Then Indra went himself The Yakṣa vanished, not intending to break the pride of Indra

In that spot where the Yakṣa stood, Indra saw standing the Goddess Pārvatī in all her glory He asked her who was this Yakṣa.

26 She replied this was verily Brahm He appeared to you to cure your conceit and delusion. You are honored, not because you have gained the victory, but because Brahm really has gained this victory for you Give up therefore the false notion—'ours is this victory' Then Indra knew Brahm, being thus taught by Umā Haimavati. For this reason alone these Devas, Agni, Vāyu and Indra are superior to other Devas, because they approached Brahma the nearest, they saw Him so close and as Indra was the first who learned that it was Brahm, he became the foremost of the Devas

Brahm appeared only for a short time to the Devas and then vanished. This is typical The first glimpse of the reality is always very momentary and evanescent, one hardly realises that he had such a glimpse at all, nay he soon begins to doubt the reality of soul-experience For it comes like the flash of a lightening illumining each dark nook of the soul; then it is gone, making the gloom deeper It lasts only for a short time, in the winking of the eye, it has appeared and gone. Though Brahm is immanent in Nature, It is hidden by it, yet in moments of rarest calm, the Reality bursts through this mask, one feels

the whole world assume a new appearance, surrounded by a halo of glory, bathed in the light of the Eternal ;—but this Brahm-mood of nature is evanescent ; the light soon vanishes from the surface of the earth, leaving it dull and monotonous as before—seeing Brahm as an Adhi-Deva “over force or over nature” is momentary only at first.

Not only the awakening soul may see the glimpses of Brahm in nature as over-Nature Adhi-Deva, but it may see Him in mind also as Adhi-âtma as over-soul. But there also the vision is not lasting—the mind vision of the over-soul is fleeting and evanescent too. For the mental sankalpa (meditation) cannot for a long time (abhikṣṇa) remember or hold the idea (upasmarah) of Brahm. The sankalpa is a sort of picture of the object thought of. While the Sankalpa of other High Beings may be held by the mind for a long time, it is incapable to do so with Brahm. Brahm-dhyâna is the most difficult of all forms of meditation. But when Brahm once bursts through the mind, though only for a moment, the whole mental attitude is changed, the man becomes a regenerated being—he becomes an object of love and veneration to others, a worldteacher—a Tad-vana Himself.

But what are the Sâdhanâs, the practices, the means, by which this Brahm-vision (whether in nature as Adhideva or in mind as Adhi-âtma) may be made more constant, more permanent, a perpetual state of mind ? The answer is simple—Tapas, dama, &c., Learn thought control, practice austerity, control your conduct and senses, perform all religious and social duties (Karmas), study the sacred scriptures, and speak truth. In other words regulate your thoughts, desires, acts and speech. Let all thoughts be high and Brahm-directed, desires purified and controlled, acts good and helpful to humanity, speech true and not paining any one, and thus the vision that was once a flash, a wink, a vague and undefined mental suggestion becomes thy constant companion and help, thy friend guide and Self. Then the Adhi-deva the over-God in nature, and the Adhi-âtma the Over-Soul in Man will be found to be the aspect of the one reality, and the Man and Nature, its image and mirror

MADHVA SCHOOL.

This Upaniṣad being in the form of a dialogue between Brahmā and Śiva, these two are the Rīṣis or the Seers of the Upaniṣad. The Devatā is called herein Brahṁ. The metres are different, the Anuṣṭup &c which should be ascertained by counting the syllables in each verse.

Though Śiva knows Brahṁ, yet he puts the questions to Brahmā, either to elicit more detailed knowledge of Brahṁ, or to strengthen and consolidate the knowledge already obtained, or which appears to be more likely, to help humanity by teaching it the truth about the real controller and impeller of all senses. Hence Śiva asks Brahmā :—Directed by what God does the mind go towards its object, the thing desired, whether it be good or bad. The mind being an instrument or organ, cannot be self-moved, but must be moved by some body other than itself. It cannot be moved by the Jīva or the individual soul, for if the Manas were under the control of the Jīva, it would not dwell upon or think of objects which the soul does not desire to think. That the Manas in its functions is independent of the Jīva, is proved by the fact that it is so hard to be controlled by the Jīva. Manas is as much independent of Jīva as the lungs—both perform their functions involuntarily of the Jīva or Soul. Hence, it follows the mind must be impelled by a being higher and mightier than the individual Jīva. The question then is what is that Being? If it be said that the Life Force, that controls and carries on the respiratory and other functions in the body independent of Jīva, is the force that directs the Manas also, then we ask by whom is that Primeval Life Force the First Breath—sent forth, who controls Prāṇa? For the Primeval Prāṇa also does not appear to be independent, and though it may be the immediate cause of the functioning of the mind, it cannot be the ultimate cause. Who or what then is the ultimate cause, the Prime Motor, through which and because of which the mind, the feelings and senses, all are set working.

2. To this question, Brahmā replies, that the Prime Motor is Viṣṇu, who is the ear of the ear, mind of the mind, &c. It is Viṣṇu who is the giver of these organs to perform their functions. Those wise ones who realise this all pervasive force of Viṣṇu become immortal.

3. Inconceivable and inexpressible is the glory and might of Viṣṇu. The senses and the Devas presiding over them cannot fully comprehend Him. We do not know fully how He rules this universe, and how He brought it into existence. We have not even a general knowledge of His mode of Government, far less any detailed knowledge. For He is the all-whole, while we are but parts; and parts can never know the whole.

4. For He is different from and more than the visible world. He is over and above the invisible—above the known and the unknown. He is the best of all, and everywhere. He is above the manifested and the unmanifested—Vyakta and Avyakta. Thus all the ancients have sung about Him, and thus have we heard it of old.

5. The next verses up to the end of the chapter explain the same idea, but from a different standpoint. For Jīva is knowable through manas and speech ; but Brahm not being a Jīva, there was no necessity of saying that He is not to be known by mind or speech. The real object of the saying that He is not known by mind or speech &c, is explained in these verses. Brahm cannot be fully expressed by speech, but He directs the speech. Know Brahm in this light ; and do not mistake Jīva to be Brahm. For Brahm is that which is upāśa-te “ nearest to thee ”—thy inmost self. The same idea is expressed in the verse quoted at the end of the First Chapter, “ He is the leader of Pīṭha and the rest. He knows all He is everywhere. Whom in all His details and fully no one knows : this Jīva is not that Brahm called Viṣṇu the unchangeable. But He is that which is near to thee as thy Governor.” Know that to be Brahm.

CHAPTER II.

The same idea that Brahm cannot be fully known is explained in these verses. O Maheśvara ! If thou thinkest “ I know Brahm fully ”—then even thou knowest but a small portion of Brahm ; because He is infinite. Because thou knowest but a small portion of Him, therefore thou must find out and meditate now on the side of Brahm which is manifested in thee and in the Devas : as this aspect has been overlooked by thee.

2 “ Admitting that others cannot know Brahm fully, but thou O Brahmā at least knowest Him fully ” To this Brahmā replies : Others say regarding me “ this Brahmā fully knows Brahmā : ” but I do not think that I know Brahm fully.

Dost thou then not know Brahm at all ? To this Brahmā says. I do not say that I do not know Brahm ; on the contrary, I do know Brahm. Brahm is not fully knowable to any one, yet He is known and knowable. Therefore amongst us he who says “ I know Brahm ”, he has not known Brahm, because he has limited Brahm and knowing Him by limitations, does not really know Him. But he who says “ I do not know Brahm ”, he has known Brahm : because he has realised that Brahm is unlimited.

Having mentioned that the Brahm cannot be fully known by śravaṇa or hearing or external teaching, the Upaniṣad further says that He cannot be known by meditation or Manana also. He who is of opinion that Brahm cannot be mediated upon by him has really thought out Brahm ; and has understood His Infinity. He who thinks he has grasped Brahm by thinking, he has not really found Him, because he has not realised His Infinity.

3. Not only Brahm cannot be fully taught (Śravaṇa) and fully thought out (Manana). He cannot be fully perceived by direct vision (Sākṣātkāra). Those who think they have realised Brahm by direct vision, have not got

Sākṣātkāra of Brahm, but those who think "we have not realised Brahm by direct intuition" have realised Him. The three words veda, matam, and vijñātam used in the above three verses, represent the three states of knowledge. "Veda" or "knowing" represents intellectual knowledge, understanding a thing through lower mind. "Matam" represents the knowledge of a thing obtained by meditating upon it, a higher stage than intellectual; in which scope is given to the Higher mind to influence the lower. The third stage is that of Vijñātam or Buddhic vision, the functioning of the Vijñānamayaakoṣa. Brahm is not to be known fully by either of these three means—the Metaphysician, the Yogī and the Seer, have all but partial knowledge of Brahm, though their instruments of knowledge are more and more refined.

If Brahm cannot be fully known, then it is impossible for Jīva to attain Mokṣa, for attainment of salvation means fully realisation of God. To this the Upaniṣad answers—even by partial knowledge (pratibodha) even by knowing Brahm to the extent of one's capacity of knowledge, the immortality is obtained. The lower Manas, (intellectual knowledge), higher Manas (meditation knowledge) and Vijñāna (Buddhic knowledge) differ in each individual, the capacity is not the same in all. But that is no hinderance to every one acquiring Mokṣa. For Brahm is an infinite ocean of sweetness, every one can take out of it that much as he is capable of holding—but that much is enough for that Jīva, enough to make him eternally immortal. No knower of Brahm ever comes back into Saṃsāra. He becomes Mukta

If Jñāna leads to immortality, what is the use of Karma? Jñāna certainly leads to immortality, but it may be an immortality of misery. Karmas are therefore necessary in order to have bliss. Therefore the Upaniṣad further says: By performing sacrifices the intense bliss is obtained, while by direct knowledge immortality is obtained. Thus knowledge and action are both necessary if one wants to be not only immortal but immortally happy. Mere Karma will make a man happy, but the happiness will not be lasting; mere Jñāna will make a man immortal, but it may be an immortality of pain. Sacrificial action, with Brahm-Jñāna is the true path of attaining the Supreme end •

4 Admitting that Brahm-Jñāna according to one's own capacity gives immortality, when is this Brahm-Jñāna to be attained. To this the Upaniṣad says—this must be attained in this very life on earth. For if it is acquired in this life, then there is good for him, if not then there is great calamity. The wise therefore realise Brahman in this life, see Him in all Beings, and become immortal.

The whole of Madhva's commentary except the last few lines, is an extract from the *Brahma-Sâra*, a book from which he copiously quotes in other. *Upaniṣads* also. This *Brahma-Sâra* appears to be a metrical commentary on the *Upaniṣads* and I do not know whether any manuscript of it is available and who is its author and when it was composed. If it is not the work of Madhva himself, it shows that the doctrines systematised by him were current long before his time and he was its chief and most illustrious exponent.

This *Upaniṣad* also lends itself to Madhva's view of *Prâṇa*. Its very first line uses the epithet *prathama* "The First" which regard to *Prâṇa* and thus shows the great function performed by Him.

Another point which strikes the reader brought up under Śankara's system is the statement that Brahman as *Yakṣa* does not appear alone but is accompanied by at least ten Shining Ones. All the *devas* did not fall into the error in which *Agni*, *Nāsikya Vāyu* and *Indra* seemed to have fallen. The *Upaniṣad* expressly mentions that *Umâ*, daughter of *Himavat*, taught the true nature of Brahman to *Indra*. Thus she at least was free from the egoism of *Indra* and the other *devas*. If she did not fall into that error, it follows that her consort *Siva* was also free from it, as He is higher in the scale than she. Thus there must have been some *devas* who were free from that error. In Madhva's system of the hierarchy of gods there are several divinities above *S'iva*. So they also must have been free from error.

This *Upaniṣad* gives the mystic name of Brahman as *Tad-vanam* "the All-pervading Beloved;" just as the mystic name of Brahman in the *Īśa-Upaniṣad* is *Aham* "I" or "Supreme" and *Asmi* "I Am."



KENA-UPANISAD. SANKARA'S COMMENTARY.

I PADABHASYA.

INTRODUCTION.

The beginning is made of the ninth chapter of Talavakāra Brāhmaṇa with a view to explain the subject of Supreme Brahman in the Upaniṣad,—commencing with the words “Keneṣitam”, &c. In the preceding chapters, all sacrificial works have been completely dealt with, as well as the mode of meditation on Prāṇa : the substratum of all works has been shown, and (of contemplating on the visible object like the earth, &c., forming) the subject of “Karmāṅga Sāma : Next has been mentioned the subject of (the meditation of invisible objects called) Gāyatra Sāma ; then the list showing the unbroken succession of teachers and pupils. All these above-mentioned works—sacrificial offerings as well as the means of acquisition of the knowledge (of the sciences), when once properly performed, serve the purpose of purifying the nature of the “niskāma mumukṣu (or a person seeking liberation and performing works without desiring the fruits thereof). But the Karmas ordained by Śruti and Smṛiti, when performed by a person devoid of knowledge, and with a desire for fruits, cause rebirth (after a period of enjoyment in Heavens) and send the performer to the “Southern Path.” By performing works through natural inclinations and impulses, contrary to the dictates of scriptures, one descends to the state of beasts and brutes,—down to inanimate matter. Because says the Śruti:—“In neither of the two ways these small creatures (flies, worms, &c.) are continually passing through cycle of rebirth, of whom it may be said,—“Be born and die.” There is a third place” [Chānd. Upa. V. 10. 8.] So also the “mantra” sings, “the three sorts of creatures (the viviparous, oviparous, vegetables,) went to very painful states, not going on either of the above two paths.” The person whose nature has been thoroughly purified from all admixtures, who is without desires, who is not attracted by any of the objective and unreal relations of means and ends,—this dispassion arising from a particular purification of the mind,—owing to good acts done in this life or a past life,—such a person feels an inclination to enquire into the subject of the Inner Soul. This subject is thus treated in the forms of question and answer by the Śruti “Keneṣitam, &c.” In the Kathopanishad, it has also been said, “The Self-existent pierced the openings of the senses, so that they turn outwards, therefore man looks outwards, not inwards at the Soul

within. Some wise man, however, with eye averted (from sensual objects) and desirous of immortality, saw the Inner Self " (iv i.) So also in the Atharvan Mṇḍaka-Upaniṣad :—"For the purpose of knowing that which is not created, he approaches, sacred word in his hand, a teacher, who knows the 'Veda' and who is solely devoted to Brahman " (I 2. 2.)

In this way only can a dispassionate person obtain the ability of studying, knowing and understanding the science of the subject of the Inner Soul, and in no other way. And from this science of Brahman, the Inner Soul,—ignorance is destroyed in its entirety,—the seed of transmigration, the cause of the impulses towards desires and acts. Thus says the Mantra :—"Where then is delusion, where is sorrow?" [Īś Upa. 7.] The knower of Brahman goes across sorrow." [Chând Upa VIII, I, 3.] The fetters of the heart are broken, all doubts are destroyed and all his works become exhausted,—incapable of bearing fruit—when the Being who is supreme is seen." [Mund Upa 11. 2. 8.] Say the Śrutis : "Cannot this be accomplished by knowledge (Jñāna) conjoined with works (Karma)?" No Because in the Bṛihadāraṇyaka it is mentioned that the Karmas (works) produce effect other than salvation. Having promised, "Let me have a wife," it goes on to say, "By (means of a) son, this world is to be conquered, and by no work. By sacrificial works, the world of Pitri is to be conquered, and by inferior knowledge, the world of the Devas." (Bṛi Up I. 5. 16) So that the means of the conquest of Ātman is separate from that by which the three worlds can be conquered. In that very Upaniṣad, the reason is also given why a person should assume the ascetic state relinquishing the worldly concerns. Thus, "what shall we do with offspring,—we, who have this Self and this world of Brahman" (Bṛi. Upa IV. 4 22) The explanation of the above is this :—With offsprings, works and knowledge connected therewith, which are the causes of migration to the non-Ātmic region, what shall we do? We do not wish to obtain these three worlds, which are unreal and which are subject to (the law of) causality as we desire to obtain the world which is natural, unborn, undecaying, undying, fearless and which knows no increment or decrement through works. That world, real and permanent, is not attainable by any means other than the cessation of Ignorance (Avidyā). Therefore, there should be the relinquishing of all desires by having acquired the knowledge of Brahman, the Absolute Inner Self.

The knowledge of Brahman,—the Absolute Inner Self is moreover, impossible of being co-existent with works. Because it is not reasonable to expect the co-existence of the knowledge relating to Brahman, the Absolute, Inner Self in which the perception of all distinction has vanished, with work in which there exists, admittedly always, the consciousness of distinctions, in the shape of subject. Because the knowledge of Brahman is not dependent upon subject but is the principal object *per se* :—therefore, by the Śrutis—"Kenesitam," &c., is shown this inquiry about Brahman, the subject of Absolute Self to be made by such a person as is disgusted with all external means and ends, both visible and invisible. And the exposition of a subject in the shape of question and answer between the teacher and the pupil is a very pleasant way of instruction, in matters abstruse and difficult. Moreover, this mode shows that this knowledge is not attainable by mere argumentation. For, say the Śruti

(Kaṭ. Up. I. ii. 9) "That knowledge is not to be gained or destroyed by arguments." This is a rule laid down by the Śruti, "A man who meets with a teacher to inform him, obtains the true knowledge. (Chând. Up. VI. 14. 2.) That knowledge only which is learned from teacher (Acharya) leads to real good." (Chând. Up. IV. 9. 3.) So also is the rule laid down by the Gîta (IV. 34), "Know THAT by serving the teacher," &c. Having approached, according to rules, a teacher who knows Brahman, being fully convinced that there is no other refuge, but in the Absolute, Inner Self, desiring to obtain the fearless, the eternal, the all-good, the unchangeable, it is supposed that some one asks this question "Keneshitam, &c."

VERSE I.

By whom decreed, does the mind (manas) being shot forth (like an arrow) descend (towards its object)? By whom desired, does the first breath proceed? By whom directed, do men utter this speech? What effulgent One is it that regulates the eye and the ear.

Kena—'By what agent,' īṣitaṁ—'desired,' manas patati—the mind falls, i.e., goes towards its object. The phrase "towards its object" should be supplied to complete the sense. The root "īṣu" from which this word "īṣita" is derived belongs to the Tudadi class, and means "to wish" and it is not the root "is" belonging to the Bhvâdi class meaning 'to move,' nor to the Kryâdi class meaning "to let fly" 'to do repeatedly.' Because the sense of "continued repetition" or of "motion" is not possible here; it follows that "īṣitaṁ" is the form derived from the root "īṣu" "to wish." The intermediate 'i' and the mode of its addition in "īṣita," are both vedic.

From this very word "īṣita" is derived the word "preṣita" by the addition of the prefix "pra," and it means "dispatched on an errand" or appointed. Now by simply using the word "preṣita"—"appointed" without using the word "īṣita"—"desired" there would have arisen the question as to the appointer (presayita) and appointment. That is to say, the question would arise "by what sort of appointment" and "what is the mode or method of appointment." But by using the epithet "īṣitaṁ,"—"desired," both these questions cease to arise. Because then the meaning of the above text will be restricted thus "by whose mere wish is the man appointed."

Ques.—If this be the sense desired, then the same object is attained by simply using the words "keneshitam" and the words "preṣita" should not be used. And, moreover, according to the maxim of interpretation "the more the words, the more the meaning," the proper interpretation of the above passage ought to be as follows:—"by what appointed, whether by will, or by act or by speech."

Ans.—No: This interpretation contradicts the very hypothesis on which this question is based. Because it is admitted that the questioner is he who has become disgusted with all these transitory forms and bodies, that are the effects of karma, and who consequently is desirous of knowing that which is other than these, viz., that which is permanent, changeless, and eternal substance, otherwise, the whole question would be useless, for it is a well-known thing that ordinary appointments are made by beings having physical bodies,

through their will, act or speech and there can be no doubt as to their appointment, or the method of appointment.

Ques.—If this be so, even then also, you do not really explain the meaning of the word “preṣita.”

Ans.—No : Because the above question is that of a doubter, who is not sure whether the body causes all these functions or something above and beyond this. Therefore, we find that the word “preṣita” has the following particular meaning.—Does the appointment of means, &c., belong to this well-known combination of effects and causes (*i.e.*, the body) or is it separate from such combinations, and does it belong to the mere will of an Absolute Independent Being? To show the above meanings the double epithets “preṣita” and “iṣita” have been used in the text “kenesitam patati preṣitam &c.”

Obj. :—It is well-known that the mind, being independent and free, goes of its own free will towards its objects, how, then, does this question arise, “By whom decreed, the mind goes to its objects?” *Ans.*—Had the mind been really free in the choice of its objects, of likings and dislikings, then no one would ever have thought of any injurious thing. But, as a matter of fact, the mind though knowing the evil consequences, forms evil determinations. The mind verily enters upon a most painful course of action, though advised to desist. Therefore the question is a proper one, “By whom decreed &c.”

“Kena prāṇah yuktah,”—by whom is the life appointed, “yuktah,” *i.e.*, “niyuktah”—means “appointed,” “sent;” “By whom sent does it go towards its own activities. The word “prathama”—first, qualifies the word prāṇah, as all the activities of the other senses are dependent upon prāṇah, which precedes them. “Kenesitam”—by whom desired, “vadanti”—they utter *i.e.*, mankind utter, “vāchamimam,”—this speech consisting of sound.

Similarly what “effulgent being” (deva,) directs, *i.e.*, appoints or regulates the eye and the ear to their respective objects

VERSE II.

The Ear of the ear, the Mind of the mind, what verily is the Speech of the speech, what certainly is the Breath of the breath, and the Eye the eye. Freeing (themselves from the consciousness of identity with these lower selves), the wise passing away from this world, becomes immortal.

Being thus asked, the teacher addressing the competent pupil says :—“Listen then the answer to your question, namely, who is the deva that sends forth these groups of organs, such as the mind and the rest to their respective object, and in what way does he send them forth “Śrotrasya Śrotram,”—that by which any thing is heard is called ‘Śrotra’ *i.e.*, the sense or the instrument of perceiving the sounds, the manifestor of sounds, the sense of hearing. That which you have asked, “what deva directs the ear and the eye,” is he who is the “hearing” of the sense of hearing. Instead of saying such and such a being having such and such qualities, directs the ear, &c, you say he is the ear of the ear. Is not this answer in fact, no suitable answer at all but rather begging the questions? No. There is no such fault; because it cannot be expressed by any other attributes. The answer would have been a *petitio principii*, if like the man who handles a scyth, the director of the ear, &c, also were to be understood to be an entity possessed of its own

specific activities separate from the activities of the ear, &c. But it is not meant that like the mover, the director of ear, &c., has any separate specific activities of its own. In fact, its existence is inferred from the activities of ear, &c., which are compound and designed things, activities beginning with sensation, reflection and determination, ending in complete perception of the sound &c., depend upon it for their very existence. From the maxim Saukhya I. 138) "all compound and designed things are designed for the use of some body other than the thing itself," it is a non-compound and simple, and simple entity separate from the ear, &c., and to fulfil whose purpose the ear, &c., have been created, like a house built for the enjoyment of the owner thereof. Therefore, the reply, "he is the ear of the ear, &c.," is very appropriate.

Well, what is the meaning of the words "śrotrasya" and "śrotram" &c.? Is not the meaning that there is an ear other than this is as absurd as there is another light which illumines this light? No. There is no such fault here. The sense of the word "ear of the ear" is this:—It has been shown that ear of the faculty of manifesting its object, i.e., sound. And this faculty of the ear of manifesting its object exists because of the existence of the conscious, eternal, non-compound light of Ātman inside of all. There would exist no such faculty in the absence of such light of Self. This then is the meaning of the words, "the ear of the ear." So also in other Śrutis:—"The Self indeed is his light, for having the Self alone as his light, man sits, moves about, &c." (Bri. Upa IV 36.) "By his light all this is lighted," (Kath. Upa V. 15) "By whose light the sun shines," (Mahānā I. 3) "The light inherent in the sun which illumines the whole universe &c.," "As the light of the sun illumines the whole universe, so the Ātman illumines the whole body, Oh! Bharata," (Gītā, XV 12, XIII 33) So also in the Kathopanishat (V. 13), "He is the eternal among the non-eternals, the intelligent of the intelligents, &c. This removes the generally accepted erroneous notion that the ear &c., is intelligent by its own intelligence. There is, in fact, a Higher Self, approachable by the intellect of the wise, the inner-most of all, the immutable, non-decaying, the immortal, the fearless, and the birthless, who is the ear, &c., of the ear, &c., that is the cause of the faculty of hearing, &c. This is the sense of the words of the above reply.

Similarly, he is the mind of the mind, i.e., of the inner organ called "antahkarana." Because, without the light of consciousness, the inner organ not capable of manifesting its function, of doubting and determining, &c. Therefore he is even the Mind of the mind. The word "manas" in the text means "manas" technically so called, as well as the faculty called "buddhi:" it means manas and buddhi taken as one. "Yad vācho hi vācham":—the word "yad" is yasmāt—because "and it is to be joined with every one of the words Śrotra, &c., Such as: "yasmāch chrotrasya śrotram, yasmanmanaso manaḥ," &c., as he is the ear of the ear, as he is the mind of the mind, so he is the speech of the speech. The word vācham is in the accusative case, but it should be changed into the nominative; because "prāṇsya prāṇah" shows that the construction is nominative, "prāṇah" being in the nominative case.

Why do you not change "prāṇsya prāṇah" into "prāṇasya prāṇam" in the accusative form on the analogy of "vācho ho vācham" instead? No; having regard to the construction of the majority "vācham" should be changed

into "vāk," otherwise we shall have to change two words 'sa' into 'tam' and 'prāṇah' into 'prāṇam'. In 'preserving' intact the cases, these two words, and prāṇah, the regard is paid to the majority, moreover it is proper, that the things questioned about should be indicated by the nominative case. He about whom you have asked is the life, (prāṇa) of life, of the specific function called prana or breath that is the vitalising power of prāṇa has been caused by him, for the vital functions do not take place unless they be presided over by the self. Says the Śruti, "who could breathe who could breathe forth, if that Bliss existed not in the ether of the heart." (Tait. II. 7. 1.) "He it is who sends up the breath (prāṇa) and who throws back the breath (apāna)" (Kāth Upa V. 3). In [that Upaniṣad also it will be mentioned hereafter, "By which breath is drawn, that above known is Brahman."

Will it not be more proper, having regard to the context, to take the word "prāṇa" to mean the faculty of smell, as it is read in the "Ear of ear," &c.? Very true: but by taking prāṇah as meaning "breath," the sense of smell is also included therein. This is the meaning of the Śruti: the sense of the whole context is that Brahman is the Being through whose existence all these organs have their functioning.

So also He is the eye. That power of apprehending from which is the eye, that manifests form, belongs to the Ātma caitanya (the Self as Consciousness), being the sūtrātman. He is therefore, the Eye of the eye.

The phrase "having known the above-mentioned Brahman who is the Ear of the ear, &c.", should be inserted in the text in order to complete the sense; because it is the intention of the questioner to know the object of the question. the knowledge being the object of his question. The phrase "having known," &c, should be supplied, because the concluding sentence "become immortal" also indicates the same thing, for through knowledge alone immortality is reached," and because "through knowledge one becomes free", therefore the phrase "having knowledge" should be inserted. Renouncing the group of organs like ear, &c, and having become free, that is, having left the idea that the ear &c, are the self: those who renounce the notion of the ear, &c, being the self, are wise and possessed of wisdom. The notion of the ear, &c, being the self, cannot be renounced without the most refined wisdom "Pretya" departing or becoming separate; asmālokaṭ"—from this world—consisting of this worldly idea of "mine," "I," and attachment towards sons, friends, family and kinsmen. The sense is, that having renounced all desires, they become "amṛita"—immortal, having the quality of non-dying. For say the Śrutis:—"Neither by sacrificial works nor by progeny, nor by wealth, but by renunciation alone they reached immortality" (Mahā. Up) "The Self-existent pierced the openings of the senses so that they turn forward, therefore man looks forward, not backwards into himself. Some wise man, however, with his eye closed, and wishing for immortality saw the Self behind." (Kāth, Upa. IV. 1): "When all desires that dwell in his heart cease, then the mortal becomes immortal and obtains Brahman" (Ibid. VI. 14)

Or, the passage may be thus construed,—"atimuchya,"—having become freed, i.e., by attaining perfection in the renunciation of desires; "pretya

asmālokaṭ'—departing from this world, being separated from this body, *i. e.*, having died.

VERSE III.

There the eye cannot reach, nor can thither go the speech, nor manas? We do not understand how may one teach It. Different It is even from the manifest and from the non-manifest far above. Thus have we heard from the ancients who explained It to us.

Because, Brahman is the ear of the ear &c., hence "na tatra" means "not there," *i. e.*, in that Brahman: "chakṣur gaohchhati,"—eye does not go; because it is impossible for a thing to enter into its own self. Similarly the speech does not go there. When by speech, sound uttered expresses its object, then it is said that the speech goes to its object. Of that sound and of its instrument by which sound is produced, Brahman is the source (ātman), therefore it is said that "speech does not go there." As the fire being the burner, as also the illuminer (of others), does not illumine or burn itself, so also the mind being the doubter and determinator of other objects, cannot doubt or determine the self, for Brahman is the self of that mind also. The knowledge of a thing takes place through the senses and the mind, Brahman being not cognisable by these two, we do know it, that is, we cannot say, "Brahman is of this sort." Hence we do not understand how and in what way, that Brahman may be taught; in what way instructions about It may be given to the pupil. That which is cognisable by the senses can be taught to another by explaining its genus, attributes, action and specific qualities. But Brahman is beyond all qualifications, such as genus, &c. Therefore, it is hard to demonstrate it to a pupil by mere instructions. The phrases "we do not know" &c., show that great care should be taken in giving instruction and in comprehending its purport. Lest it may be thought that the phrases "we do not know, &c." indicate an absolute negation regarding the instruction about Brahman and the mode of such instruction, the Śruti gives the exception in the following verse. True, the Absolute cannot be demonstrated by the ordinary arguments of perception (analogy and inference) but it can certainly be demonstrated by the authority of revelation. To teach this fact, the revelation says "Anyadeva tad viditāḥ atho aviditāḥ adhi."—it is different from the known, It is also above the unknown: "anyadeva"—separate from. "Tad" *i. e.*, the subject matter of the treatise, "the ear of the ear, &c." and which is not the object of perception of these, ear, &c.: That (Brahman) is different from the known. That thing is called "known" or "viditā" which is completely reached by the verb "to know," that which becomes the object of the verb "to know," which may be known at some time, somewhat, and by some one. That which can be fully analysed is called "viditā" or known, Brahman not being capable of such analysis is, therefore, said to be different from "the known." If it is not known, then it follows, that it is unknown. To this the Śruti says "(no, it is not unknown), it is also above the unknown"—"Atho aviditāḥ adhi"—that which is opposed to "viditā" is "aviditāḥ" namely, the Unmanifest, the avidyā being the seed of the Manifest. The word "adhi" means literally "above" and it has the sense here of "different from." Because it is well-known that that which is above another is separate from that other. That which is known is limited is transient and full of sorrow, and consequently fit to be abandoned or despicable.

Therefore, by saying "Brahman is different from the known," it is meant that Brahman is not 'heya,' or a thing to be despised, and by saying "It is above the unknown" it is meant that Brahman is not capable of being taken or accepted, *i e*, it is "aheya" and "anupadeya" (not to be shunned or longed for). An object separate from one's self is chosen by another in order to accomplish an effect. But of the knower (Brahman) there is not a different object to be selected for the purpose of another. Therefore the sentence "Brahman is also different from the known and the unknown" prohibits selection and rejection with regard to Brahman, and thereby answers the questions of the pupil regarding Brahman by showing that it is not different from his own self. The sense of the whole sentence is, that the self is Brahman, because of no other object than one's own self, it is possible to say that it is different from the known and the unknown —

"This Self is Brahman" (Bṛi Upa. II. v 19), "the Self which is free from sin" (Chând Upa. VIII. 7 1), "the Brahman which is visible and not invisible, the self which is within all" (Bṛi. Upa. III 4 1), and the texts like these which are to be found in other Śrūtis demonstrate Brahman to be the self of all, devoid of all specifications, and the mere light of consciousness. The teacher now shows the traditional handing down of the above-mentioned knowledge by saying "thus we have heard from those of old who taught us this" And this also shows that Brahman is only to be understood by instruction handed down by tradition from teacher to pupil, and not by argumentation, nor by vedic knowledge, nor by understanding, nor by much learning, nor by austerities, nor by sacrifices. Thus we have heard (śuśrūma) the doctrine of ancient sages—those sages and teachers who taught (vyāchachakṣire) us (nah) that (tad) Brahman, *i e*, who explained to us and clearly told us about Brahman

VERSE IV

THAT which by speech is not expressed, by which speech is expressed, know thou **THAT** alone as Brahman, and not what is worshipped as such by the people.

By the sentence "It is different from the known, it is also above the unknown," it having been established that the self is Brahman, there arises a doubt in the mind of the hearer "how can this self be Brahman?" Because the self conditioned by name verily being engaged in work and devotion is "saṃsāri"—worldly, *i e*, subject to births and deaths; or by performing the works (sacrifices, devotion,) it (self) wishes to attain godliness such as that of Brahmā, &c., or the heavenly regions; therefore something different from the self, something, adorable like Viṣṇu, Īśvara, Indra or Prāṇa is worthy to be Brahman and not this self, for to make the self Brahman contradicts the universal conviction of mankind. And as the logicians believe in the self to be separate and different from God, similarly the sacrificers (followers of Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā) worship a God separate from the self for they say "sacrifice to this—sacrifice to that" Therefore, it is reasonable to say that what is the known, the adored of mankind, that is the Brahman, and the worshipper is different from it. The teacher knowing that this doubt has arisen in the mind of the pupil,—this being inferred by the teacher, either from some gesture or from the words of the pupil,—says, "Do not entertain any such doubt."

"Yad"—that which is mere pure consciousness. Vāchā—by speech; speech is that which is caused by or adheres firmly to the eight organs like the root of the tongue, (palate, throat, teeth, nose, lips, chest, and head), whose presiding deity is Fire, which gives expression to letters (like dentals, palatals, cerebrals, nasals, aspirates, gutturals), the organ of speech, and it also means the sounds and letters classified according to their meanings and signs. These letters when used in a proper sequence give rise to an articulate sound having sense, called word (N B. thus "gauh" is a word, made up of three letters "g," "au," and "h," arranged and distinguished by their sequence, and whenever these letters will be used in this order they will produce a word. This is the theory of the mīmāṃsakas. The commentator next mentions the theory of the sphoṭavādins) The impression produced on the mind by the sound or word is called speech. Thus says the Śruti, "the letter 'A' is verily (the source of) all speech. It becomes multiform and divided into the various classes known as Sparśa letters (from 'k' to 'm') antastha-letters (y, r, l, v, Semi-vowels), the ūsma letters ('ś, s, ṣ and h,' sibilants and aspirate) "

Tho speech is measured (metrical like the R̥gveda, &c.) or not measured (prose, like Yajurveda), or toned (musical, like Sāmaveda), it is true or false, and has various other modifications like these. By that speech, distinguished by the quality of wordiness, and possessing the organ of speech, "anavyūditam"—is not expressed, manifested or revealed (the Brahman). "Yena"—"by whom" by the Brahman, as explained above; "vāgabhyudyate"—speech is manifested along with the organs and the sense to be expressed, that is to say, it is manifested through or directed by the light of consciousness. As it has already been said before "He is the speech of speech" So also in the Br̥. Upa. (I 47), "He cannot be seen, for in part only, when breathing he is breath by name, when speaking, speech by name, &c" "He who dwells in speech (tongue), and within the speech (the tongue), whom the speech (tongue) does not know, whose body the speech is, and who rules the speech within, he is the Self" (Br̥. Upa. III 7 17), "The (power of) speech which is in the Puruṣa (or Intelligence) is established in the sounds or letters; who is the Brahman that knows it?"—Having raised this question, the Śruti gives this reply—"It is that speech, with which one speaks in dream." "For that is verily the speaking of the speaker, the eternal speech, whose form is the Light of consciousness," as says the Śruti (Br̥. Upa. 3. 6). "For speaking is inseparable from the speaker" "Tadeva"—that alone, the Self, the Brahman, the Un-surpassed, the Infinite "Know" (Viddhi), or understand it to be the Brahman because it is the great (brihat), "tvam" "thou" conditioned by speech and the rest. Speech of the speech, the eye of the eye, the ear of the ear, mind of the mind, the maker, the enjoyer, the knower, the ruler, the ordainer, are, the personal (vyavahārya) attributes applied to the transcendental impersonal Brahman—"the Brahman is knowledge and bliss" says the Śruti—Who is without any distinctions, the Absolute Oneness. So rejecting the personal attributes, know the self to be the attributeless Brahman. This is the sense of the above passage.

"Nedam"—Not this, 'yadidam'—"that which" is qualified by differences of conditions, which is non-self, such as God (Īśvara) &c, (and which the ordinary men) worship or contemplate.

Having said "know thou that to be the Brahman," the phrase "not this which they worship" is repeated to show the non-Brahmahood of the non-self. Or the repetition is for the sake of establishing a restrictive rule (so that no one may worship non-self), or an exclusive rule by which the false idea of other things being Brahman may be excluded.

VERSE V.

THAT which does not think with the manas, That by which, they say, the manas is thought; know thou That alone as Brahman: Not what is worshipped as such by the people.

"Yan manasā na manute":—"That which does not think by the mind," manas here means the antahkarana or the inner organ; it is taken here to include the manas and buddhi in one (*i. e.*, the faculties of cogitation and determination). That by which one thinks (manute) is called manas, the common substratum of all objects (of perception). For says the Śruti (Bri Upa I 53), "Desire, representation, doubt, faith, want of faith, memory, want of memory, shame, reflexion, fear,—all this is mind" Manas is, therefore, that which possesses the functions of desire, &c.: by that mind "yad"—'that which,' namely, the light of consciousness, the Illuminator of mind, 'na manute,'—'does not think, does not raise doubt and does not also determine them; because He is the ruler of the mind by being its illuminator. The inner organ, though entering into every object, cannot enter into itself. The faculty of thinking of the mind exists because the light of consciousness is within it and illumines it. Because they, the knowers of Brahman, say (āhuh) or describe that by Him (yena) the Brahman, the mind with its functions is thought, *i. e.*, is made an object of perception and pervasion, therefore that (tad) alone (eva) know thou ('viddhi) to be Brahman, the self of mind, the inmost causer of consciousness, "nedam, &c.," 'not that which people here adore' should be explained as above.

VERSE VI.

THAT which does not see with the eye, by which one see (the functions of) the eyes; know thou That alone as Brahman: Not what is worshipped as such by the people.

"Yach chaksusā" &c,—that which does not see with the eye, does not cognize objects through the instrumentality of the eye, but by whom (yena) being joined with the function of the inner organ, antahkarana, man sees, *i. e.*, the functions of the eye as separated by the distinguishing functions of the inner, *i. e.*, people perceive the objects through the spiritual sight of self.

VERSE VII.

THAT which does not hear with the ear, by which this ear is heard: know thou That alone as Brahman: Not what is worshipped as such by the people.

"Yachchhrotrena, &c."—that which man does not hear with the ear, that which people do not make object of perception through the ear, *i. e.*, that which the ear joined with the functions of the mind through the action of ākāśa presided over by the duties of direction, does not perceive; by whom (yena) this ear (śrotamīdan) is heard (śrutam), is made an object of perception by the spiritual light of Self "Tadeva," &c., to be explained as above.

VERSE VIII.

THAT which does not breathe with breath, by which the breath is breathed; know thou That alone as Brahman: Not what is worshipped as such by the people.

"Yat prāṇena," &c.—that which by the prāṇa, by the earthly smell residing in the cavities of the nostrils, joined with the functions of Prāṇa and of the inner organ, does not breathe (prāṇīti) it, does not perceive the object of smell, but the Prāṇa being vitalised by that spiritual light of Self, goes towards its object. The rest as above.

II.

VERSE IX.

If thou thinkest "I know Brahman well," little 'indeed' it is which thou knowest of the nature of Brahman.

"You are the self or the Brahman, above all choice and rejection," being established, lest the pupil may think because "I am verily Brahman, therefore, I know my self very well," the teacher propounds the following paradox in order to shake the conviction of the pupil. "Yadī" &c, Well, is it not the object of this treatise that Brahman should be known well? True, the desired object is to produce a settled knowledge, but "I know well" is not that settled knowledge. When a thing to be known becomes an object of perception, then it becomes possible to know it well: As the burning power of fire is manifested only with regard to objects that are capable of being burnt, and not with regard to the fire itself which is the burner. Now, the well-established conclusion of the whole of the Vedānta Philosophy is that Brahman is the very self of every knower. In this Upaniṣad also the same doctrine is established by the above question and the answer "He is the ear of the ear," &c "that which is not expressed by speech &c," also demonstrates the same with greater fulness of details: and the conclusion of the class of persons who know Brahman is taught in the saying "It is separate from the known, it is above the unknown," which stands in the beginning of the book, and the saying which ends in:—"It is not understood by those who understand it, it is understood by those who do not understand it." Therefore, the teacher does well to remove the false notion regarding Brahman entertained by the pupil when he said "I know it well." For the knower cannot be an object of knowledge to the knower, as fire cannot be an object of combustion to the fire: and of Brahman, there is no other knower to whom Brahman may be an object of knowledge, for says the Śrīnti, (Bṛi Upa III. 8 11.) "Except Brahman, there is no other knower," and it thus debars the existence of any other knower: Therefore, the notion that "I know Brahman well," is verily false. Therefore the teacher is right when he says, "if thou thinkest, &c"

If (yadi) ever thou thinkest (manyase), "I know well," i.e., "I know Brahman well." Sometimes as has been heard "though Brahman is hard to understand, yet some wise men free from sins, understand it and some do not," therefore, lest the pupil might have misunderstood him, the teacher uses the word "If". For we have seen from the example of Virochana, the king of the Asuras, that though he was a learned man and the son of Prajāpati, yet he misunderstood the teaching; for when it was said to him by the teacher (Chānd Up VIII. 7. 3) "The person that is seen in the eye, that is the Self. This is what I have said. This is the immortal, the fear-

less, this is Brahman" Virochana, on account of his natural defect, understood it, in the direct contrary sense which was never intended, for he understood it to mean that the body was Brahman. On the contrary, Indra the king of the Devas and the fellow pupil of Virochana, being taught once, twice and thrice could not grasp it, but having removed his natural defects, it was at the fourth repetition that he understood Brahman which was taught even at the first time. Even with regard to worldly matters we see, that hearing one (explanation) at one and the same time from the same one teacher some understands it in its true sense, another understands it in a false sense, and a third understands it in a directly contrary sense, and some does not understand it at all. How much more liable to misapprehension and misunderstanding is the transcendental philosophy of Self. Here there is mutual conflict between all logicians whether they believe in the theory of "Sat" or "Asat." Therefore this warning speech of the teacher is very appropriate when he says, though it has been explicitly taught before, that Brahman is not known, yet if owing to misapprehension thou thinkest that thou knowest Brahman well." "Daharam" means "little," surely then thou knowest or understandest little of Brahman's form. Are there many forms of Brahman, big and small, that the text uses the words 'dahara-form' or the little-form of Brahman? Well asked. Through the conditions of the name and form, Brahman (appears to have) many forms, but essentially "He is without sound, without touch, without form, without decay, without taste, eternal, without smell, without beginning, without end, &c." (Kath. Upa I. 3. 15). These words negative the existence of all forms with regard to Brahman.

Obj :—Is it not so that by whatever attribute a thing is described (rûpyate), that description is the form of that thing? So also with regard to Brahman. By whatever attribute it is described let that attribute be its form. Hence it is said, consciousness cannot be the attribute of the elements like earth, &c., or of the prakriti, or of all the modifications of these. Similarly it is not the attribute of the external organs like the ear, &c., or of the inner organs like mind, intellect. Therefore, consciousness is the form of Brahman. Brahman is described by consciousness. As says the Śruti (Bri. Upa III 9. 28) "Brahman is knowledge and bliss." He is like consciousness solidified" Bri. Upa. II 4. 11). "He is truth and consciousness" (Tait. Upa. II. 1. 1) "Knowledge is Brahman" (Ait Upa 5. 3) All these verses of the Śruti determine the form of Brahman.

Ans :—True it is, Still THAT is pointed out by the words, "knowledge, &c.," through the medium of mind, body, the sense organs and other limitations, and by force of analogy with these, Brahman is described as limited by the growth, contraction, removal or destruction of the body, &c, but this is not the essential description of Brahman. The essential description will be established later on by the verse—"It is not understood by those who understand it, it is understood by those who do not understand it" "Yaddidam"—"that which," i.e., "of this Brahman's form"—this phrase should be construed with the preceding sentence.

Not only thou knowest little of the form of Brahman, which is limited by the conditions of human soul (adhyâtma), but I think also that the form of Brahman limited by the conditions of physical nature (ādidaivata), which thou knowest with regard to the forces of nature (devas), is also indeed very little that thou knowest. That which is the adhyâtma (psychological)

aspect of Brahman and that which is the *ādharma* (nature or celestial) aspect of Brahman, being also limited by the conditions of the *devas*, and being, therefore little, these two aspects do not fully define or exhaust Brahman. The sense of the passage is, that Brahman can never be known well, in which is the cessation of all particular conditions, which is quiet, endless, one, without a second, the infinite, the ever-existing.

"Atha :"—Because this is so, therefore I think (many) that thou must still reflect upon and enquire into the nature of Brahman.

Thus, being addressed by teacher, the pupil sitting apart from all, concentrated his mind on this subject, reflect upon the sense of the sacred text taught by the teacher, demonstrated it to himself by logical reasoning, in fact, fully realised it, and going back to the teacher, said "Now I think (many) that Brahman is known"

VERSE X.

I do not think that I know (It) well ; and I do not know that I know not. Whoever amongst us knows That and whoever knows not does not know.

"How?" "Hear it please:—I do not think that I know it well, &c, I do not indeed say "I know Brahman well." Being then told by the teacher "Well, the Brahman is not then known by you." The pupil replies, "I do not know that I do not know Brahman" The word "cha"—'and' in "veda cha" implies "na veda cha"—'I do not know.'

Well. are not these two contradictory terms "I do not know Brahman," and "I do not know that I do not know?" "If thou dost not think that thou knowest well how thinkest thou that thou knowest?" and if thou thinkest that thou knowest, why thinkest thou not that thou knowest well? Leaving aside doubts and mistakes, it is a contradiction in term to say once that an object is known by a person, and then say that that very object is not well known by that very person. Brahman cannot be known through doubtfulness nor can he be determined by mistake. For doubt and mistake are well known to be the cause of all mischief everywhere

Though thus being shaken by the teacher the pupil did not shake in in his faith. But owing to the strength obtained from the previously taught text of the teacher "Brahman is different from the known and above the unknown," and with the strength derived from the realization and demonstration of the above text, from the tradition of the Schools and from the assent of his own mind, the pupil with a thundering voice replied, showing his firm faith in the Divine Science of Brahman in the following words:—"Whoever amongst us (*nah*), the students of *Brahma-vidyā* knows the nature of the above formula, he knows that Brahman" What is that formula mentioned? The pupil replies "I do not know that I do not know." That which was taught by the phrase "It is different from the known and above the unknown," is also answered under a different phraseology by the pupil when having fully realised the sense of the above, through inference and experiment, he says "I do not know that I do not know." Thus the pupil says in order to answer the attacks of his teacher and to remove the doubts of the dull-brained. So the thundering becomes appropriate when he says "Whoever amongst us knows the true nature of the above formula knows Brahman."

VERSE XI.

By whom (Brahman) is not thought, by him (Brahman) is thought: by whom (Brahman) is thought, by him (He is) not known: (Brahman) is not known by those who know (Him) known by those who do not know (Him).

Having closed the dialogue between the pupil and the teacher, the Śruti now explains in the following verses "yasyâ matam," &c., the final purport of the whole dialogue in its own way. "Yasya"—by whom, by what knower of Brahman 'amatam'—'is not thought, i. e., Brahman is not known,' 'is not understood,' that is, he whose opinion (matam) or conviction is that the Brahman is not known or comprehended by him; "tasya" by him; "matam" is thought, Brahman is known. "Yasya"—by whom' again; "matam"—'is thought, i. e., whose opinion or conviction is that the Brahman is known and comprehended by me; "na veda sah"—he does not know, verily he does not understand Brahman. The Śruti now determines the nature of the above mentioned two classes of persons who know and who do not know. "Avijñātām"—'not understood,' i. e., Brahman is, as if, not thought or known; "vijñātām"—by those who understand it, by those who fully know every thing. But this Brahman appears as if (vijñātām) 'understood' or known, (avijñātām) by those who do not understand, who do not see all sides, who see the soul to consist of the senses, mind (manas) and intellect (buddhi). The word "avijñātām" does not mean here those who absolutely have no understanding, for such persons can never have the idea 'we know Brahman' and moreover those who see the soul to consist in the limitations of senses, mind and intellect can never attain to the understanding that these are but various limitations of Brahman. By the knowledge merely of the limitations of 'Buddhi,' &c., arises the false idea that Brahman is known, therefore, the sentence "If it is understood by those who do not understand", presupposes the previous existence of incomplete and partial knowledge, and does not hold good with the want of all knowledge. Or, the second half of the stanza "vijñātām vijñātām" may be considered to be an argument to support the previous statement "It is not understood by him who understands" (for a man, who knows the nature of a mother-of-pearl, is incapable of understanding it as any thing else, he cannot think it to be silver, &c., for to him there is no such adhyāsa or false attribution or superimposition, but to a man who does know the nature of the mother-of-pearl, understands it to be silver and so it may be said that silver (false attribution) 'is understood' by him who does not understand the true nature of the mother-of-pearl. Similarly those who know the reality, know that with reference to Brahman there can be no relation of cognisability, it is a false notion and so they do not understand Brahman to be a cognisable object. ("Ānandagiri.")

VERSE XII.

Known with regard to every thought (He is) known. Thus (one) attains immortality. By self (one) obtains strength by Knowledge obtains immortality.

It has been determined that "It not understood by those who understand." If, then, Brahman be absolutely non understood then there will be no difference between the ordinary worldly men and the spiritual knowers-of-

Brahman, and the sentence "it is not understood" is also mutually self contradictory. The text now shows how that Brahman may become fully known.

"Pratibodha viditam" is equal to "bodham prati viditam"—known with regard to every thought. The word "bodha" here means the object of understanding (thoughts) or precepts. He to whom all precepts become objects of cognition, is the self which knows all thoughts, is the seer of every precept whose nature is pure "chit-śakti" (consciousness). The knowledge of the inner self is not obtained through any thing else, but by thought; because there is no difference between it and the thought. Therefore, when Brahman is known to be the inner self of thought itself, then he is known (matam), that is, one sees him fully. By thinking it to be the seer of all thoughts is demonstrated its being of the nature of cognition, free from increase or decrease, production or loss, eternal, pure self, without distinction and one in all creatures. There is an absence of all distinguishing marks in it; it is like space in jars, mountain caves, &c. The purport of the revealed texts is that Brahman is different from the known and the unknown and thus its being pure becomes also deduced. Says another Śruti (Bṛi. Upa. III, 3 23, &c.) "The seer of sight, the hearer of hearing, the thinker of thought, the knower of knowledge &c."

The phrase "pratibodha-viditam" is explained some times thus:—as it is known by the mark of the act of thinking, *i. e.*, when from the the mark of the act of thinking is inferentially known the existence of its agent, as one says, "That which moves the branch of a tree is the air, the existence of air being deduced from the mark of the motion of the branch." This explanation is liable to this objection:—

The self (Ātman) would become a substance possessing the power of thinking; and would be of the nature of thought itself. But thought is produced and is destroyed. When thought is produced then the Ātman becomes specified with the quality of thought. When thought is destroyed, then it becomes, in the absence of thought, a mere undifferentiated substance. That being so, the Ātman becomes changeable, having parts non-eternal, impure, &c., and it does not become possible to separate these faults from Ātman.

The theory of Kanāda is also objectionable. For according to the followers of Kanāda, thought is the product of the combination of mind (manas) with self (Ātman), and thus thought inseparably exists in self. This thinking subsists in self though we know that self is not changeable. In this case, too, the Ātman becomes a mere substance, like a pot, in which the quality of colour exists inseparably. In this view also, Brahman becomes a mere unconscious substance. But the Śrutis contradict such a view, for they declare "Brahman is knowledge and bliss," &c. (Bṛi. Upa. III 9. 28). Moreover, Ātman being without part there is the absence of locality in Ātman (therefore, it is wrong to say that as by contact with fire, pots, iron, &c., become also fiery, so by contact with manas, which is a non-material cause (*i. e.*, a formal cause), consciousness arises in the unconscious Ātman. For this is not only opposed to authority but to reason also. For that which occupies a particular locality can come in contact with another object occupying another place. But Ātman being above the limitations of place and locality, cannot come in contact with mind. Therefore it is wrong to say thought exists in Ātman. If it be said, Ātman being all pervading comes simultaneously in contact with all objects having shape, and thus it has contact with mind also, then arises the following objection:—It being

eternally in contact with mind, the law of the recollection of ideas in memory by the mind becomes nullified (for the law is that the ideas in memory arise in succession in time, different from the time when one idea is perceived or apprehended, *i.e.*, two ideas do not occupy the mind at one and the same time, and the memory of a thing arises at a time different from the time when the subject was first cognised. This being the law of association of ideas, according to Vaiśeṣika philosophy, the eternal contact of Âtman with mind contradicts this law, for such contact would necessitate the production of a remembered idea at a time when another idea occupies the mind and the combination of mind with Âtman will be then like the latent ideas or "samskāras." The fact is that when it is said Atman is all-pervading it is meant that it is free from all obstructions, nothing can obstruct it and not that it is in contact with every thing '(Anandagiri)' And in the above case Âtman would be conceived to have the attribute of being always attached to another, which, however, is against all revelation, tradition and logic. For the Śruti (revelation) and Smṛiti (tradition) both declare, "He is unattached, for he does not attach himself" (Bṛi Upa. III. 9 26); "He is unattached, though he supports all" (Gitā. XIII 14.). It contradicts Logic also. An object possessed of qualities attaches or combines with another object possessed of qualities, which is not of a different genus from it. But here the Âtman which is without qualities, without destruction, devoid of all marks, is said to combine with a thing which is not of the same genus with it, and hence such combination is against logic. Therefore Âtman, the light of never-ceasing eternal consciousness is Brahman, and this is proved with regard to Âtman then only when it is understood to be the thinker of every thought, and not otherwise. Therefore, the phrase "prati bodha viditam matam" should be understood as we have explained.

(The commentator now mentions another explanation and shows its incongruity). Some explain the phrase 'pratibodha viditam' to be the consciousness of one's Self or Self-knowledge separate from the knower and the process of knowing, as the pots, &c. So the knowledge of Self really does never take place for want of co-extensiveness, *i.e.*, the knower cannot become the known. Therefore the phrase 'knowing the Self' or Self-consciousness really should be understood to mean the knowledge or consciousness of Buddhi, &c., to which the idea of Self has been falsely attributed. Therefore to explain the phrase 'pratibodha viditam' by Self-consciousness involves contradiction in terms and makes Self a conditioned thing. (Hence the commentator says). This explanation is correct with regard to the Self only when it is considered as conditioned, for then having imagined a difference between the Self and the Self through the condition of Buddhi, one may employ the phrase "He knows the Self by the Self," and this is the sense also of the texts—(Bṛi Upa IV. 4, 23 ; Gitā VI. 20 and X 15) "He sees the Self," "O best of persons, thou alone knowest by thy own Self, the Self" Nor is it possible for the unconditioned Self to have Self-consciousness or non-Self-consciousness, for there is unity (there being nothing besides the Self). (According to Kanāda, though the Self cannot know the Self, it can know the non-Self, but the commentator refutes that position also) The essence of the Self being consciousness, it does not stand in need of another consciousness (to make it manifest), as the light does not want another light to illumine it (According to the Bauddhas Self-consciousness is intellect, and that is not the meaning here and therefore the commentator says). Taking the Bauddha-view, if the phrase meant Self-consciousness, the intellect would

be frail, transient, and non-Self and this would contradict the Śruti which declare (Bṛi. Upa. IV. 3-30,) "For knowing is inseparable from the knower because it cannot perish" So also (Mund. Upa. I. 6.) "The eternal, the omnipresent, the Lord" This indeed is the great, the unborn Self, the undecaying, the undying, the immortal, the fearless."

(Now the commentator mentions another explanation of the phrase 'pratibodha' only to refute it. Some understand the word "pratibodha" to mean "nir-nimitta-bodha," knowledge without any objects of knowledge such as the consciousness of a person in deep dreamless sleep. (Thinking on the idea "I am Brahman," so long as there are modifications of the thinking principle, the conceptions of the mind are stopped, and when there is the manifestation of the supreme bliss, something like the bliss of the dreamless sleep, that is called "asamprajñāta-samādhi." "Pratibodha" means such a "samādhi" (for says the Vārtikakāra :—"aparāyata-bodha" is called "nididhyāsana"). Some explain the term "pratibodha" by saying that it is "śakṛid-vijñāna" or once-for-all-knowledge (Or when one realizes the Self to be the changeless Brahman, there being the non-possibility of the existence of any relative thought, and no other knowledge being possible, this realisation becomes the instantaneous cause of emancipation, therefore this once-for-all-knowledge is called "pratibodha." Ignorance can not exist with Knowledge. The commentator does not approve this explanation also) For, verily, he, the Self is 'pratibodha' only both with cause and without cause ("nirnimitta" and "sanimitta") once-for-all or not so (The sense of this is :—The external "bodha" or casual or adventitious understanding which destroys ignorance (avidyā) cannot be "nir-nimitta" or absolute knowledge because its effect is "sa-nimitta" (i. e., having a cause and every effect that has a cause is relative together with its cause). Nor can the consciousness of dreamless sleep be called "nirnimitta" for this is a state of the manifested consciousness arising from the habit of stopping all the antecedent functions of the mind, and in which state there is the experiencing of happiness. Therefore memory arises when this functional state of dreamless sleep ceases to exist. Therefore, in this state of "susupti," though there is a cessation of the thinking principle there is no manifestation of Brahman, because it is a state of latency of all associations and habits, which again return on awakening. The Paramātman is always "pratibodha," i. e., he shines as a witness with regard (prati) to every understanding, i. e., every act of understanding posits Brahman).

"Amṛitatvam"—immortality, the state of non-dying, the remaining in one's own Self, the emancipation. 'Ha'—because "Vindate"—occurs, obtains : that is, one obtains verily immortality from the above "pratibodha," that is, from the knowledge of Brahman as the witness of every act of understanding.

The absolute Self or the inner Self is the cause of immortality. (The inner Self being the illuminator of all modifications of intellect, cannot be the Supreme Self or Paramātman, but the Supreme Self is a being who is outside the universe and the attainment of such extra cosmic Diety is salvation. This notion is thus combated by the commentator) Because the immortality of the Self can never be by attaining something which is non-Self (for the attainment of non-Self, like the effect of karma, is transient and non-eternal and can never lead to immortality If to remove this objection, you should

say the differentiation of Brahman is owing to the differences of conditions or "upādhi", in essence it is of the nature of Self, then, the commentator says), if the immortality of the Self is obtained by attaining something which is also Self, then the immortality of the Self is inherent and not causal (That is, Brahman being the Self, the immortality of the Self is thus demonstrated to be the innate quality of Self, Then one may object, "What is the necessity of knowledge?" To this the commentator replies). The Self is mortal in this sense, that it has the false notion of being non-Self, owing to want of true knowledge. (Through ignorance it thinks body life, &c, to be the Self. This mortality of the Self is removed by the effect of true knowledge. The Śruti now declares how by the above-mentioned knowledge of Self immortality is obtained. "Ātmanā"—by one's own Self or nature, "vindate,"—is obtained or acquired, "vīryam" seed, strength, ability. The strength obtained through wealth,—allies, charms, herbs, austerities and yoga—is not capable of overcoming death, because it is obtained by non-eternal objects. The strength resulting from the knowledge of Self, is obtained as if by the Self alone and by nothing else; therefore not being accomplished by means other than the Self, this strength obtained through the knowledge of Self is capable of overcoming death. And because the strength resulting from the knowledge of Self is as if acquired by the Self, therefore by this knowledge ("vidyayā") relating to the Self, immortality is obtained ("vindate amṛitam"). Thus says Atharvan Śruti (Mund. Upa. III. 2. 94) "This is not to be gained by one who is destitute of strength." Therefore immortality is obtained through power.

VERSE XIII

5. If here one knows, then, that is truth; if here one does not know there is the great destruction. In every object realising (the unity of self,) the wise departing from this world become immortal.

To undergo (owing to ignorance) birth, decay, death, disease, &c, is verily painful to all living beings in this world of manifold sorrows, be they gods or men, or lower animals or the souls of the deceased. If here ("iha-chet") being a man endowed with strength, one should know (avedit) understand the Self as described above in the way mentioned before, then (atha) that is the true ("satya") in this life of man. The true or "satya" is that which is indestructible, or which is the purport or object of life, or which is the state of being "sat" or existence, or that which is the sumum bonum. But if endowed with this life one does not know or understand it here, then there is great, long and endless destruction ("vinasti") or destroying in the form of non-breaking chain of recurring births, decays and deaths, &c, i. e., the round of transmigration. Therefore the Brāhmanas who understand both good and evil, thus having thought upon ("vichitya") or perceived or realised the unity of Self the Brahman in every object ("bhūteṣhu") in all creation movable or immovable; those wise ones ("dhīrah") possessed of understanding, having departed (pretya) this world ("asmā-llokāt") consisting of the idea of "my" and "I", and full of ignorance, and having attained the non-dualistic state of all being one Self; become immortal ("amṛitāḥ bhavanti") i. e. become even Brahman itself. For says the Śruti (Mund. III. 29) "He who knows that highest Brahman, becomes even Brahman".

III VERSE XIV.

1. Verily for the sake of the Devas Brahman obtained victory. In the victory of him verily the Brahman, the Deva becomes elated. They thought "Ours alone is this victory and ours alone is this glory".

"Brahman ha devebhyo vijigye" — "Brahman verily for the sake of the Devas was victorious." From the sacred texts "It is not understood, &c." (Kena Upa. XI) and the rest it follows that whatever exists, can become the object of knowledge or understanding through the various channels of knowledge; and which does not exist that can never be known, and like the horn of a hare may be imagined, but is absolutely non-existent. Similarly "Brahman is non-cognisable, therefore it is non-existent" is a delusion to which men of little understanding are liable to fall in order to prevent that the following allegorical story is commenced.

Verily that Brahman, the supreme Governor in every sense, the highest even amongst the Devas, yea, the Ruler of the rulers, the God of gods, difficult to be understood, the cause of the victory of the Devas, the cause of the defeat of the Asuras—how can that Brahman be non-existent? All the subsequent verses are intended in fact to illustrate and bring out this meaning. Or, the story may be considered as an encomium on Brahman-Vidyâ. How is that? Because by knowing Brahman the Devas like Agni, &c, obtained supremacy amongst the other Devas, whilst Indra obtained supremacy over all on account of his clearer knowledge than that of any of them. Or the story illustrates that Brahman is hard to be understood. For mighty and illustrious beings like Agni, &c, even understood Brahman with great difficulty, and so also Indra though he was the king of the Devas. Or the whole of the subsequent portion of this Upaniṣad ordain worship of the conditioned Brahman (for inferior intellects), for the sake of those who are not superior "adhikâris," and are not capable of realising the unity of self with Brahman. Or, the object of this allegory is to show the falsity of the notion of agency, &c, entertained by living beings, so long as they are devoid of Brahma-vidyâ as the Devas even had the false idea that they were the victors—(the victory really being caused by Brahman).

Brahman as described above, the supreme, verily (ha) for the sake of the Devas ("devebhyah") obtained victory ("vijigye"), in the battle between the Devas and the Asuras; and having conquered the Asuras the enemies of the world, the transgressors of the Divine Law, gave the fruit of victory to the Devas for the sake of supporting the world. In the victory ("vijaya") of him (tasya) surely ("ha") the Brahman the Devas became elated ("amahīyantaḥ"), i.e., obtained glory. The Devas did not know that victory and glory belonged to Brahman dwelling in the Self, the inner Self, the Ruler, the Omniscient, the Umpire of all actions with their respective fruits among living beings and the All-powerful. They did not know that Brahman had obtained the victory with the object of preserving the world (from the ravages of the Asuras); hence they (the Devas) thought ("auksantaḥ") falsely in this wise:—"This victory is ours only, it belongs to us in our individual and distinct forms of Agni, &c; it is our work, and ours alone is the glory,—ours 'Indra's,' Vâyu's and Agni's, it is we who are experiencing the fruit of victory, and it is not the doing of any other inner Self or God.

VERSE XV.

2. Brahman knew verily this (view) of theirs : (and) verily appeared before them : (but the Devas) knew it not: and asked) "Who is this adorable One?"

"Tad"—this; "ha"—verily. "eṣām"—theirs, "vijajñau"—know, i. e., Brahman perceived this false view of theirs. Then that All-beholder, for Brahman is the observer and mover of all creatures' activities, perceiving the false idea entertained by the Devas took pity upon them, lest they should also, like the Asuras, meet with defeat and destruction through false pride, and as if said "Let me help the Devas by removing this wrong idea of theirs." With this object, to those ("tebhyah") Devas, Brahman verily ("ha") became manifest ("prādurbabhūva") i. e., made himself perceptible to the senses of the Devas, assuming a most wonderful and astonishing form, built through the might of his "yogamāyā" (the union of the three energies, "satva," "rajas" and "tamas" is called yoga, i. e., the divine māyā.) It ("tad") the manifested Brahman the Devas did not know ("na vyajānata") and said—"Who this ("yakṣa"—"pūjya") adorable One, tho mighty being"

VERSE XVI

3. They addressed the Fire saying "O Jātaveda, do thou know who this adorable One is" Agni replied "it be so."

VERSE XVII.

4. Then he went towards him: him thus addressed the adorable One "Who art thou?" Agni replied "I am Agni: or I am Jātaveda."

VERSE XVIII.

5. "What powers reside in thee thus named" "I can burn all this—all that exists in this earth."

VERSE XIX.

6. "Then burn this straw which I place before you." He advanced towards it with all his strength but was not able to burn it. From thence indeed he turned his back (and said) "I have not been able to find out who this adorable One is."

"Te"—They; the Devas not knowing Him, with fear in their hearts and anxious to know him, addressed ("abruvan") the Fire-lord called Agni, because of its going in front ("agre gāmin agni") and called Jātaveda because of its knowing all:—"O Jātaveda! know thou in all its details, this adorable One visible to us, and tell us who is this, since thou art most powerful amongst us" Agni replied "Let it be so" and then he went towards that adorable One. When Agni had reached Him, he remained quite in His presence owing to want of confidence, though anxious to question Him. Him thus addressed that adorable One "Who art thou?" Being thus questioned by Brahman, Agni replied "I am Agni, I am also called Jātaveda" The two names indicate the pride felt by Agni owing to his being so famous. To him thus replying, Brahman said "What power and strength hast thou possessing these famous names?" He replied "I can burn this whole universe, I can reduce to ashes, whatever exists in this earth, solid &c" The word "earth" is indicative only, for Agni burns even those things which are in the firmament. Seeing him full of this conceit, Brahman placed a straw in front of Agni and said "Burn this mere straw in my presence, and if thou hast not the power to

burn it, leave for ever the conceit that thou canst burn". Being thus addressed, Agni went towards that straw, with all his strength and force but could not burn it. 'Jâtaveda' being thus unable to burn the straw and being abashed and unsuccessful in his determination, came back to the Devas silent and crest-fallen and said "I have not been able to find out who this adorable One is."

VERSE XX.

7. Then they addressed Vâyu saying "Vâyu! do thou know who this adorable one is." He replied "Let it be so."

VERSE XXI.

8. He ran towards it: (and Brahman asked) "Who art thou?" He replied "I am Vâyu; I am "Mâtariśvâ"

VERSE XXII.

9. "What power is in you thus known?" "I can take away all this—all that exists in this earth."

VERSE XXIII.

10. "Thus, do thou take away this straw I place before you."

Then, he went towards it with all his might but could not take it away: From thence indeed he turned his back (and said) "I could not know who this adorable One is."

After that the 'Devas' addressed Vâyu in the same way as they had asked Agni. The rest of the passage is the same as before. The word Vâyu comes from a root which means "that which blows, that which moves, that which scents". The word "mâtariśvâ" means "growing" ('svayati) in the mother space ("mâtari"). The word "âdâdîyam—grihnyâm" "I can take up." The rest as before.

VERSE XXIV.

11. Then the Devas addressed Indra "Do thou know who this adorable One is." "Let it be so." He ran towards that (being) but He disappeared from before him.

VERSE XXV.

12. In that very spot he met with a very graceful female form and wondrous fair and asked Her "Who is this adorable One?"

Then the Devas addressed Indra in the same way as before: Indra means the supreme ruler, and "maghavan" means the Powerful. Indra said "Let it be so." Indra went towards him. Brahman vanished from before Indra who had approached him. Brahman vanished and did not even grant an interview to Indra, in order to remove the conceit of Kingship and Indra-hood from Indra.

And Indra remained in that very spot or âkâśa where stood that wonderful Being, and where manifesting himself he had vanished, i.e., in the âkâśa or locality where Indra was at the time of the disappearance of Brahman. He did not turn back like Agni &c, but remained there contemplating "Who is this wonderful Being?" Seeing the devotion of Indra towards that adorable One, there appeared to him, knowledge in the form of a woman called Umâ. Indra addressed that Umâ who was wondrous fairest of all fair things is knowledge, hence the appropriateness of the title of "wondrous fair" for Umâ. "Haimavatam"—wondrous fair, as if she was decked all over with gold;

or this word may mean Umâ, the daughter of Himavat, who being always in the company of the all-knowing Lord (Mahâdeva) had the power of knowing Brahman. Indra asked that Umâ "Tell me of a truth, who is this wonderful Being that having manifested himself, has just now vanished."

IV.

VERSE XXVI.

1. She replied "Verily, it is Brahman; in the victory of Brahman, you have obtained glory." It is indeed from thence that he came to know that it is Brahman.

1. She replied "Verily it is Brahman, in the victory of that Brahman the Lord, you are merely occasions, for the Asuras have been conquered really by that Lord. In the victory of that Brahman you have obtained glory." The word "etad" is used adverbially here. She continued, "False, verily is your conceit when you think, 'Ours alone is this victory, ours alone is this glory,' "Tatah"—from that, that is, from that speech of Umâ Indra, came to know of Brahman, and by no other independent means.

VERSE XXVII

2. Therefore these Devas surpassed all other Devas because they, Agni, Vâyu and Indra touched this nearest One they first came to know that it is Brahman.

2. Because these Devas, namely, Agni, Vâyu and Indra had obtained nearness to Brahman by having seen Him and conversed with Him, therefore these Devas surpassed all other Devas in all lordly attributes, powers, greatness &c. The word "iva" in the text is either redundant or means "only," "indeed," and therefore these Devas, i.e., Agni, Vâyu and Indra touched, ('pasparśa') Brahman the nearest ("neditam"), because most beloved by the above-mentioned means of seeing and conversing with Brahman, because they among the gods were the first or the foremost who had known 'This is Brahman'.

VERSE XXVIII.

3. Therefore, Indra surpassed all other Devas, for he touched the nearest One, for he first came to know that it is Brahman.

3. Because Agni and Vâyu also knew from the speech of Indra, and Indra heard for the first time from the speech of Umâ, that "this is Brahman," therefore Indra surpassed all other Devas, because he touched the nearest as he was the first who had thus known Brahman.

VERSE XXIX.

4. Of Him there is this simile. That which is like this lightening when it flasheth. and He winked as it were. These refer to the supra-natural (aspect)

4. Of the above-described Brahman, this is an allegorical teaching ("âdeśa-upamopodeśa") That is called an "âdeśa" by which instructions about the incomparable Brahman are given by means of comparisons. What is that teaching? That which is well-known among men as lightening when it flasheth. Brahman is likened unto the flash of such lightening. The word "â" means "like unto," i.e., like unto the flash of lightening. So also in other Śrûtis we find the same simile "as an instantaneous lightening Brahman disappeared from before the Devas having revealed himself for a moment

only, like the flash of a lightning" Or we may take here the luminosity of the lightning; the sense then will be "like the light of the lightning, it flashed once only." The word "iti" in the text shows the end of the first illustration. The word "it" means "and" and is a copulative conjunction, meaning "this is another simile." What is that other simile? It winked, as the eye winketh. The cansative affix in "nyamimisat" is self-descriptive and does not change the meaning of the root. The "ā" means here also "like unto" That is like the appearance of the objects of sight when one winks. These illustrations refer to Brahman from an "ādhidaiva" point of view, namely, comparing Brahman to objective forces like lightning or winking. (It is well-known that the winkings of the eye are very quick. So is Brahman a quick worker in the matter of creation, &c. because there are no obstacles and no exertion to him. This attribute of execution is the "ādhidaivata" attribute of Brahman Ānandagiri).

VERSE XXX.

5. Now the aspect of subjective self. That which goes as it were (to Brahman) is Manas. By this one remembers (It) to be near and constantly thinks (of it)

5 Now is taught the illustration relating to the subjective self or "adhyātma." That which goes as if to Brahman is mind, i.e., as if it approaches Brahman, as if it makes Brahman an object of perception. As by this (anena) mind, the devotee remembers Brahman as if near him, and repeatedly ("abhiśṅgam") thinks of Him, so the constant thought (sankalpa) of his mind has Brahman for its object. Brahman is revealed or is made, as if, as an object of perception, through the functions of imagination (sankalpa) and memory, &c., of the mind, which conditions Brahman as an Upādhi. This forming of mental conception of Brahman is subjective illustration, that is, Brahman is internally revealed co-extensively with every percept of the mind, as he is revealed externally in the quick illumination of the lightning and winking. By such illustrations and similes Brahman is explained to men of blunt intellects, for such brains cannot conceive the absolute unconditioned Brahman. (The subjective teaching of this is "Let my mind constantly go towards that Brahman who has been described above as light". Such should be the thought of the devotee:—"Let my mind constantly and again and again contemplate on Brahman who is my subjective self" Ānandagiri).

VERSE XXXI.

6. That is verily called "Tadvanam," should be worshipped as "Tadvanam." All beings long for him indeed who knows him as such.

6. Moreover, that Brahman is verily called "Tadvanam." The word "tadvanam" is equal to "tasya vanam," "desired of him," i.e., Brahman is the object of desire or adoration of all living beings, because He is the Inner Self of all. Hence He is known by the name of Tadvanam. Therefore he ought to be worshipped (vanam) i.e., ought to be meditated upon. He who worships Brahman under this name gets the following reward. He becomes the object of desire for all creatures, who worships Brahman under the above mentioned attributes. (Above has been taught the fruit in the shape of the Lordship acquired by a person who worships Saguna Brahman. But the highest aspirant

renounces even such Divine Power and wants to know the supreme secret and hence) asks the Teacher the next question.

VERSE XXXII.

7. "Tell me, O! the Upaniṣat." "The Upaniṣat has been taught to thee. I have indeed told you the Upaniṣat relating to Brahman."

7. "Tell me the Upaniṣat, the secret doctrine, the thing to be meditated upon, O Lord." Thus being questioned by the pupil, the Teacher replies "The Upaniṣat has been taught thee already." What is that? He replies, "It is the Brāhmī Upaniṣat," the doctrine relating to the supreme Self, surpassing all lower knowledge. The word "vāvata": this restricts the sense of the subsequent passage, *i. e.*, "The Upaniṣat we told" *i. e.*, even has been told the science of supreme Self—the Upaniṣat.

What is the object of the pupil in again asking the question "Tell me the Upaniṣat," when he had already heard the Secret Doctrine relating to the supreme Self? If the question relates to a thing already taught, then it is an useless question, being a mere repetition and grinding an already ground flour. If there still remained something supplementary to the Upaniṣat, then it was not proper to finish the Upaniṣat with the "phala-śruti" in the words "pretyāsmāl lokād amritāḥ bhavanti." Therefore the question is also irrelevant, if it refers to something supplementary to the Upaniṣat because there is nothing to supplement it. What is then the object of the question? We reply, the question is this:—Is the above mentioned Upaniṣat merely a subsidiary teaching to something else and does it stand in need of some complementary means of acquirement of knowledge, in order to fully complete the Upaniṣat or does it not at all stand in such need? If it stands in need then tell me that portion of the Upaniṣat which will remove that need. And if it does not stand in such need, then finish the Upaniṣat by using some such phrases as "there is nothing higher than it," as has been used by Pippalāda in his secret doctrine (see *Prāśna Upaniṣat*, last chapter verse 7, where Pippalāda closes his teaching by saying "So far do I know this highest Brahman, there is nothing higher than it.") The above is then the sense of the question. In this view also the answer of the teacher becomes relevant, when he says "I have told thee the Upaniṣat" meaning thereby, that the Upaniṣat has come to an end here.

Objection—It cannot be meant to show the closing of the book, because there yet remains something further to be taught, as we find in the next verse, relating to austerities, restraint, &c? *Ans.* True, there remains something to be taught by the teacher, but it is not something which completes the secret doctrine or which is of co-ordinate importance as a means of acquiring the secret doctrine. But desirous of teaching the means of obtaining *Brahma Vidyā*—(Divine knowledge), penances, &c, have been read in the same category with the Vedas and their subsidiary portions (*Vedāṅgas*) (*Tapa, dama, &c.*, are not portions of supreme wisdom because they have been read along with others which are not portions of divine wisdom). Verily neither the Vedas, nor their "aṅgas" like "*śikṣā*," &c, are supplementary teachings of realizing Brahman; nor are they co-ordinate means of acquiring that intuition.

Question—Let all this *Tapa, Dama, Karma, Satya, &c.*, though read in one series be so divided as to be applied to their appropriate object, just as we divide the mantras of invoking deities found in the "*sūkta-vāka*" according to the particular deities. Thus as the *sūktavākas* are modified so also we shall

modify this verse by saying that penance, sacrifice, restraint, truth, &c., are supplementary to the divine Wisdom or as complementary, means of acquiring divine Wisdom, and we shall take the Veda and its angas of attaining knowledge relating to karma by means of their teaching, and thus the division of the above six things becomes appropriate (namely, the four Tapa, Dama, Karma, and Satya we take as "Brahma-Vidyā śeṣa" while the Vedas and the Vedangas we take as "karmātma jñāna upāya") and thus we do because it is possible to do so, on account of their sense.

Answer.—No, this is not possible. Such a division cannot take place as a valid fact. For it is not possible, that Brahma Vidyā should stand in need of any supplementary practices or any co-ordinate means, because this Wisdom destroys the consciousness of all differences in fruits, instruments and action. Moreover a person who desires Mokṣa, must always renounce every karma, together with its means, because the firm devotion to the interior self, which is free from all external object, is divine Wisdom, and its fruit is the highest perfection. (Thus the fruits of karma are distinct and separate, and karma, therefore, can never be a supplementary means of Brahma-knowledge). As, says the Śruti :—"Verily It is known by him alone who renounces; of him who renounces is the supreme stago that transcends all causes?"

Therefore karma can never be either a Sahakāri cause or karma śeṣa cause of divine Wisdom. Therefore it is incorrect to divide this verse (xxxii) on the analogy of Sūkta Vāka mantras. Therefore, the question and its answer contained in this verse (xxxii) relates to all conclusion; that is, the student wishes that the teacher should declare that the Upanisat has come to an end, only upto this and no further has the Upanisat or the secret doctrine been taught. It stands in need of nothing else and it leads to immortality.

VERSE XXXIII

8. Tapa, Dama, Karma are her feet : Vedas are all her limbs : Truth is her abode.

8. Of that Brahma-Vidyā (knowledge of the Supreme) which we have told thee, Tapa, &c, are the means of attaining it. "Tapa" means the control of bodily senses and of mind "Dama" means restraint. "Karma" means sacrifices like Agnihotra, &c. Because it is seen that the knowledge of truth is produced, when the quality of "satva" is purified by means of these refining processes, and because to a person whose taints have not been removed, it is useless to teach the doctrine of Brahman, for even if taught, such a person shall not have conviction in Brahman, or shall have a wrong notion altogether, such as we see in the case of Virochana, &c, as opposed to India. Therefore either in this life or in many past lives, the satva must have been purified by Tapa, &c, before wisdom arises. As we hear in the following mantra.

"If these truths have been told to a high-minded man, who has the highest devotion to God, and to his guru, as to God, then they will shine forth, —then they will shine forth indged" (Svet Upa vi 26). So also we find in the Smṛiti "Knowledge arises when evil acts of men are exhausted" The word "iti" in the text is used in the illustrative sense, for besides 'Tapa' Dama, &c., others also are helpers in producing "jñāna" such as.—Amanitvam, &c, mentioned in the Gītā (13-7) "Pratisthā" means feet they are as if the feet of Brahma vidyā. As a man is established on feet, so Brahma-vidya is firmly established on these. The Vedas means the four Vedas

and "sarvāṅgāni" means all its subsidiary portions, such as the six well-known works called "śikṣā," &c. The Vedas, because they explain karma and jñāna, the "aṅgas" because they serve to preserve the Vedas, are also therefore called the Pratiṣṭhā or the foot of Brahma-vidyā. On the word "pratiṣṭhā" being taken as a simile with foot, the Vedas represent other various limbs of Brahma-vidyā and therefore "sarvāṅgāni" means all the "aṅgas" like head, chest, &c., and not the Vedāṅgas. In this view the Vedāṅgas like śikṣā, &c., should be understood to have been included in the word Veda and have not been separately mentioned. For when a whole is mentioned, all the parts become mentioned thereby, because the parts all reside in the whole. "Satyam ayatanam"—That in which the Upanisads reside is True. Wisdom dwells in those holy persons, who are free from guile and crookedness of speech, mind and act, it does not dwell in persons having Asura-nature and full of guile.

For says the Śruti "To them belong, that pure Brahma-world, to them, namely, in whom there is nothing crooked, nothing false and no guile" (Praśna Upa. I. 16). Therefore truth is considered to be the abode of Brahman. Though "satya" or truth is included in Tapa, &c., on which "jñāna" is based yet the separate mention of "satya" as the abode of wisdom is for the sake of vindicating its superiority as a mode of acquiring knowledge, for says the Smṛiti "Hundreds of Aśvamedha sacrifices put on one scale of the balance and the Truth on the other scale, the single truth will counterbalance a thousand Aśvamedha sacrifices."

VERSE XXXIV.

9. He who knows her, thus being free from all sins is established in the blissful region, the infinite and highest of all, there he is established (indeed).

9. Though this Brahma Vidyā has been taught in the first part of the Kena Upaniṣat and though it has been outlized in the allegorical narrative of the Brahman and the Devas and its fruit immortality has also been declared in the previous verse, yet in conclusion is being declared the fruit of Brahma-Vidyā. Having destroyed all sins consisting of ignorance, desire and action and which is the seed of this transmigration, having purified one's self he goes to that "ananta" or endless "svargaloka" or his own self or blissful Brahman. The word "ananta" qualifies the word "svarga" in the text, and therefore the word "svarga" here does not mean the Indra's Heaven (or Trivṛtapa). If it be said that the word "ananta" here is used figuratively, then also we say that the word "jyeye" indicates that it is not so used. For "jyeye," means higher—highest of all; therefore it means one's own Self, which is the Highest. In such a Self he remains and does not come back to this world.

END OF PADA BHĀṢYA.

THE
KATHA UPANIṢAD

THE KĀTHA UPANIṢAD.

Regarding the Kātha Upaniṣad, Prof. Max Muller writes :—

“One of the best known among the Upaniṣads is the Kātha Upaniṣad. It was first introduced to the knowledge of European scholars by Ram Mohan Roy, one of the most enlightened benefactors of his own country, and, it may still turn out, one of the most enlightened benefactors of mankind. It has since been frequently translated and discussed, and it certainly deserves the most careful consideration of all who are interested in the growth of religious and philosophical ideas. It does not seem likely that we possess it in its original form, for there are clear traces of later additions in it. There is, in fact, the same story told in the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa* III 11, 8, only with this difference that in the Brāhmaṇa freedom from death and birth is obtained by a peculiar performance of a sacrifice, while in the Upaniṣad it is obtained by knowledge only.

“The Upaniṣad consists of a dialogue between a young child, called Nāchiketas, and Yama, the ruler of departed spirits. The father of Nāchiketas had offered what is called an All-sacrifice, which requires a man to give away all that he possesses. His son, hearing of his father's vow, asks him, whether he does or does not mean to fulfil his vow without reserve. At first the father hesitates: at last, becoming angry, he says: ‘Yes, I shall give thee also unto death.’

“The father, having once said so, was bound to fulfil his vow, to sacrifice his son to death. The son was quite willing to go, in order to redeem his father's rash promise.

“‘I go,’ he says, ‘as the first, at the head of many (who have still to die); I go in the midst of many (who are now dying). What Yama (the ruler of the departed) has to do, that he will do unto me to-day.’

“‘Look back, how it was with those who came before; look forward how it will be with those who come hereafter. A mortal ripens like corn;—like corn they spring up again.’

“When Nāchiketas entered the abode of the departed, their ruler, Yama, was absent, and his new guest was left for three days without receiving due hospitality.

“In order to make up for this neglect, Yama, when he returns, grants him three boons to choose.

“The first boon which Nāchiketas chooses is, that his father may not be angry with him any more.

“The second boon is, that Yama may teach him some peculiar form of sacrifice.

“Then comes the third boon:

“Nāchiketas says: ‘There is that doubt, when man is dead, some saying that he is, others that he is not: this I should like to know, taught by thee. This is the third of my boons.’”

It has been taken implicitly by all translators, that the third boon asked by Nāchiketas was regarding what is now-a-days called the survival of human personality after death. Whether man has a soul, and whether

it survives death are no doubt questions of primary importance: and all religions (except perhaps Judaism) give a decided answer in the affirmative to these questions. As regards the Jews, it is said that the immortality of the soul was not revealed to them. Be that as it may, in India, however, the existence of the soul, its pre-existence and survival of death were taken as axiomatic truths: and no doubts seem to have been ever raised on these points. It is not, therefore, likely that Nāchiketas should have asked, as his highest boon, the answer to the question whether the soul of man was immortal or not. The unknown author of this Upaniṣad could not have meant that, for the following reasons:—

Firstly.—Nāchiketas is shown to be a boy filled with Holy Spirit, (Śraddhā) and admonishes his father thus:—

"Unblessed, surely are the worlds to which a man goes by giving (as his 'promised present at a sacrifice') cows which have drunk water, eaten hay, given their milk and are barren." (I-1-3).

Thus in the very third verse Nāchiketas speaks of the worlds of the unblessed, the regions of pain and sorrow, *in after life*, to which a man goes after death, who cheats the officiating priest by giving him poor and worthless presents. Nāchiketas, who believed in regions of the unblessed, could not have asked a trisism like the survival of the soul after death. Nāchiketas knew well the law of rebirth also and believed in it, for he says (I. 6) "A mortal ripens like a corn, like corn he springs up again."

Secondly.—The story says that Nāchiketas was sent to the region of Yama—the abode of the dead. He had left his physical body and was talking with Yama all the same. From his own personal experience, he could not have entertained any doubt as to the existence of the soul after death. Madhva, therefore, very pertinently remarks.—न च मृत्वा यमं प्राप्स्य नाचिकेतसो "मृतोऽस्ति न वा" इति संशयो दृश्यते.—"To Nāchiketas, who had died and was (consciously still) present before Yama, the doubt whether the dead exist or not would be inappropriate," (his own present experience being a direct answer to his own question). A person who is undergoing a particular experience, at a particular time, would be the last man to ask whether such an experience exists or not.

Thirdly.—According to Śāṅkara, the second boon, which Nāchiketas asks is regarding heaven.

"Thou knowest, O Death, the fire-sacrifice which leads us to heaven; tell it to me, for I am full of faith. Those who live in the heaven-world reach immortality—this I ask as my second boon."

Nāchiketas believed in a future state of recompense, where soul enjoyed the fruits of its good works. He believed in heaven. A person, who believes in Heaven, could not have any doubt as to the existence of soul after death. Rāmāṇja, therefore, in his comment on the Vedānta Sūtra 1-2-12, in interpreting this Upaniṣad, rightly remarks:—

"For his second boon, again, he chooses the knowledge of a sacrificial fire, which has a result to be experienced only by a soul that has departed from the body, and this choice also can be clearly made only by one who knows that the soul is something different from the body."

Thus Nāchiketas, who is represented here as believing both in Heaven (Swarga-loka) and Hell (Aaanda-loka) could not have asked the third question as popularly understood.

No doubt, to minds like those of Myers and other scientific men, this appears to be the problem of problems; and answer to it is eagerly sought for, in seance rooms and from the apparitions of the living and the dead. To a materialist or a follower of Chārvaka this is a pertinent question. But it does not come with good grace from the mouth of a Nāchiketas, who admonishes his father with the terrors of Hell, and wants to learn from Yama the secret of getting into Heaven.

Fourthly.—The story of Nāchiketas has another version in the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa of the Yajur Veda. There the third boon which Nāchiketas asks is not whether the soul survives physical death; but how to conquer re-death (punar-mṛityu). In other words, Nāchiketas asks how to get Mukti or Release, so that there may be no necessity of re-birth (punarjanma) and *a fortiori* of re-death (punar-mṛityu). This version we find in Taitt. Br. III-1 18. Thus it reads.—तृतीयं वृणीष्वेति । पुनर्मृत्योर्मेऽपविति ब्रूहि इति होवाच । “(Yama said): ask the third boon (Nāchiketas replied) Tell me the method of vanquishing re-death.” This also indicates that the Katha version of this well-known legend could not have meant, by its third question, a simple point like the survival of soul after death.

Even the western interpretators of the Vedas are unanimous in admitting that the Vedic Rsis, in spite of all their worship of the elemental forces of nature, had a firm conviction of After-life. The Upanisads which represent an advance on the Vedic age could not have, therefore, asked such a primary question. Nor do we find, in any other Upanisad this question asked. The interpretation, therefore, of Madhva and Rāmānuja is near the truth, *i.e.*, that the third question does not relate to survival of soul after death, but to the far more transcendental question—the survival of individual consciousness in the state of Nirvāna or Mukti, and whether the Released are within the government of God or transcend that even.

The following extract from the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, III-11-8 as translated by Max Muller is given here to elucidate the points above urged —

“Vājaśravasa, wishing for reward, sacrificed all his wealth. He had a son, called Nāchiketas. While he was still a boy, faith entered into him at the time when the cows that were to be given (by his father) as presents to the priest, were brought in. He said: “Father, to whom wilt thou give me?” He said so a second and third time. But father turned round and said to him: ‘To Death I give thee.’

“Then a voice said to young Gautama, as he stood up: ‘Ho (thy father) said, ‘Go away to the house of Death, I give thee to Death.’ ‘Go therefore to Death when he is not at home, and dwell in his house for three nights without eating. If he should ask thee ‘Boy, how many nights hast thou been here?’ say, ‘Three.’ When he asks thee, ‘What didst thou eat the first night?’ say, ‘Thy offspring.’ ‘What didst thou eat second night?’ say, ‘Thy cattle.’ ‘What didst thou eat the third night?’ say, ‘Thy good works.’

"He went to death, while he was away from home, and he dwelt in his house for three nights without eating. When Death returned, he asked: 'Boy, how many nights hast thou been here?' He answered: 'Three.' 'What didst thou eat the first night?' 'Thy offspring.' 'What didst thou eat the second night?' 'Thy cattle.' 'What didst thou eat the third night?' 'Thy good works.'

Then he said: 'My respect to thee, O venerable sir! Choose a boon.'

'May I return living to my father,' he said.

'Choose a second boon.'

'Tell me how my good works may never perish.'

"Then he explained to him this Nāchiketa fire (sacrifice), and hence his good works do not perish.

'Choose a third boon.'

'Tell me the conquest of re-death.'

"Then he explained to him this (chief) Nāchiketa fire (sacrifice), and hence he conquered re-death."

[*Extract from Rāmānuj's Śrī Bhāṣya on I 2, 12 as translated in the S B E Vol XLVIII, p 269, by Dr G Thibaut*]

"But a new objection is raised, the initial passage, I, 1, 20, 'That doubt which there is when a man is dead—Some saying, he is, others, he is not, clearly asks a question as to the true nature of the individual soul, and we hence conclude that this soul forms the topic of the whole chapter—Not so, we reply. That question does not spring from any doubt as to the existence or non-existence of the soul apart from body: for if this were so, the two first boons chosen by Nāchiketas would be unsuitable. For the story runs as follows. When the sacrifice offered by the father of Nāchiketas—at which all the possessions of the sacrificer were to be given to the priests—is drawing towards its close, the boy, feeling afraid that some deficiency on the part of the gifts might render the sacrifice unavailing, and dutifully wishing to render his father's sacrifice complete by giving his own person also, repeatedly asks his father, 'And to whom will you give me?' The father, irritated by the boy's persistent questioning, gives an angry reply, and in consequence of this the boy goes to the palace of Yama, and Yama being absent, stays there for three days without eating. Yama on his return is alarmed at this neglect of hospitality, and wishing to make up for it allows him to choose three boons. Nāchiketa, thereupon, full of faith and piety, chooses as his first boon that his father should forgive him. Now it is clear that conduct of this kind would not be possible in the case of one not convinced of the soul having an existence independent of the body. For his second boon, again, he chooses the knowledge of a sacrificial fire, which has a result to be experienced only by a soul that has departed from the body—and this choice also can clearly be made only by one who knows that the soul is something different from the body. When, therefore, he chooses for his third boon the clearing up of his doubt as to the existence of the soul after death (as stated in v 20), it is evident that his question is prompted by the desire to acquire knowledge of the true nature of the highest Self—which knowledge has the form of meditation on the highest Self,—and by means thereof, knowledge of the true nature of final Release which consists in obtaining

the highest Brahman. The passage, therefore, is not concerned merely with the problem as to the separation of the soul from the body, but rather with the problem of the Self freeing itself from all bondage whatever—the same problem, in fact, with which another scriptural passage also is concerned, *viz.*, ‘When he has departed there is no more knowledge’ (Bṛ Up II, 4, 12). The full purport of Nāchiketas’ question, therefore, is as follows. When a man qualified for Release has died and thus freed himself from all bondage, there arises a doubt as to his existence or non-existence—a doubt due to the disagreement of philosophers as to the true nature of Release, in order to clear up this doubt I wish to learn from thee the true nature of the state of Release—Philosophers, indeed, hold many widely differing opinion as to what constitutes Release. Some hold that the Self is constituted by consciousness only, and that Release consists in the total destruction of this essential nature of the Self. Others, while holding the same opinion as to the nature of the Self, define release as the passing away of Nescience (*avidyā*). Others hold that the Self is, in itself, non-sentient like a stone, but possesses, in the state of bondage, certain distinctive qualities, such as knowledge, and so on. Release then consists in the total removal of all these qualities, the Self remaining in a state of pure isolation (*kaivalya*). Others, again, who acknowledge a highest Self free from all imperfection, maintain that through connexion with limiting adjuncts that Self enters on the condition of an individual soul; Release then means the pure existence of the highest Self, consequent on the passing away of the limiting adjuncts. Those, however, who understand the Vedānta, teach as follows: There is a highest Brahman which is the sole cause of the entire universe, which is antagonistic to all evil, whose essential nature is infinite knowledge and blessedness, which itself comprises within itself numberless auspicious qualities of supreme excellence, which is different in nature from all other beings, and which constitutes the inner Self of all. Of this Brahman, the individual souls—whose true nature is unlimited knowledge, and whose only essential attribute is the intuition of the Supreme Self—are modes, in so far, namely, as they constitute its body. The true nature of these souls is, however, obscured by Nescience, *i.e.*, the influence of the beginningless chain of works; and by release then we have to understand that intuition of the highest Self, which is the natural state of the individual souls, and which follows on the destruction of Nescience. When Nāchiketas desires Yama graciously to teach him the true nature of Release and the means to attain it, Yama at first tests him by dwelling on the difficulty of comprehending Release, and by tempting him with various worldly enjoyments. But having in this way recognised the boy’s thorough fitness, he in the end instructs him as to the kind of meditation on the highest Self which constitutes knowledge of the highest Reality, as to the nature of Release—which consists in reaching the abode of the highest Self,—and as to all the required details. This instruction begins at 1, 2, 12, ‘The Ancient one who is difficult to see, &c., and extends up to 1, 3, 9, and that is the highest place of Viṣṇu.”

•
•

THE
PRAŚNA UPANISAD.

THE PRAŚNA UPANIŚAD.

The Praśna is one of the three classical Atharvan Upaniśads. The classical Upaniśads are generally counted as ten and sometimes twelve. They are :—

1. Isā or Isāvāsya or Vājasaneyā Samhitā Upaniśad.
2. Kena or Talavakāra Upaniśad
3. Katha Upaniśad
4. Praśna Upaniśad
5. Muṇḍaka Upaniśad.
6. Māṇḍuka Upaniśad
7. Taittirīya Upaniśad.
8. Antareya Upaniśad.
9. Chhândogya Upaniśad.
10. Bṛihad Āraṇyaka or Vājasaneyā Brāhmaṇa Upaniśad.
11. Śvetāśvatara Upaniśad.
12. Kauṣītaki Upaniśad.

The Praśna, Muṇḍaka and Māṇḍuka Upaniśads belong to the Atharva Veda. One uniform idea runs through them and they have a family resemblance. All of them lay great stress on the mystic sound AUM or Pranava. In fact, the whole of the Māṇḍuka Upaniśad is an exposition of that syllable while each of the other two have portions devoted to this.

The Praśna Upaniśad is also called the Secret Doctrine of the Six Questions. Six searchers of God go to a Sage called Pippalāda and put to him six questions : and these questions and answers form the substance of this Upaniśad. These questions are arranged in a graduated scale of difficulty, while the first question is the most general, the sixth is the most specific and particular—the first deals with the creation in the Universal sense, or the cosmogony, and the macrocosm, the last deals with the God in man or the microcosm. The great law of Polarity, the law of the Positive and the Negative, the Light and Darkness, the Spirit and Matter, the Life and Energy, the *Ahuramazda* and the *Ahriman* is the key note of this Upaniśad. The first creation of the Lord, or rather His first emanations are the *Prāṇa* and the *Rayī*—the Life-Principle or the Consciousness side, and the Rayī or the energy or the Matter or the Form side of creation. It is the intermingling of these two that give rise to all this diversity. The one is active, positive and the male principle, the other is the passive, negative and the female principle. The first question and answer mainly deals with this. It shows how Space and Time, and Causation arise and fix the limits of a universe and how the various hierarchies of the *Devas* begin to take part in administering the so-called Laws of Nature, when the creation starts. The various names given to these *Prāṇa* and *Rayī* are the Sun and the Moon, the Day and the Night, the Life and the Form. The following list shows this duality.—

Prāṇa	Rayī
Āditya	Chandramas.
Day	Night.
The Sun	The Moon.
Amūrta	Mūrta.
Life	Form.
Spirit	Matter.

Northern Path
Invisible •

Southern Path.
Visible.

The Prāṇa plays a very important part in the Hindu systems of Philosophy and Religion—but it occupies perhaps nowhere so pre-eminently high a position as in the system of Śrī Madhva. With him this Prāṇa is the Great Mediator, the Intercessor, the First Begotten, the Anointed, the Light that shines in the Darkness, the Abode of God, the Saviour Next to God, Prāṇa occupies the highest place of honor. At the time of the final Release, it is He who leads the liberated soul to the presence of the Most High. He is the Great Geometrician of the Universe; as the Ray, may be called the Great Architect of the Universe. These three—Īśvara, Prāṇa and Rayi—the Lord, the Breath, the Wealth—are the Eternal Trinity. The great hymn to Prāṇa in Praśna chapter 2, fully bears out the high estimation put on this principle by Sri Madhva. This Upaniṣad is in a way a fuller exposition of some of the points dealt with in the Muṇḍaka.

The First Praśna describes the Seven Prajāpatis or Creative Logoi arranged in a descending order, and each giving rise to a pair. These seven Prajāpatis and the pairs belonging to them are shown below :—

<i>Prajāpati.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Pair.</i>	
First Prajāpati,	The Great Cause	... The Prāṇa	... The Rayi.
Second "	The Great Space	.. The Sun	... The Moon.
Third "	The Great Time	... The Ascending Arc,	The Descending Arc.
Fourth "	The Manu or Month	... The Bright half	... The Dark half
Fifth "	The Day-Night or Deva	... The Day	... The Night.
Sixth "	The Husband-Wife or Man.	The Husband	... The Wife
Seventh "	The Food or Mineral, &c.	The Sperm	... The Germ.

The above hierarchy of seven shows how these Prajāpatis have each their respective spheres: from the guardian angels of the Physical plane and of the human and the Deva planes and then the plane of the Manus or Rīsīs, the plane of the Year or the Great Time or the planetary Logoi, the plane of the Great Space or Ādityas, the sons of Infinity or the Solar Logoi of different solar systems, and the last plane of the Most High or the Absolute or Viṣṇu.

The Second question is three-fold. What energies or devas *support* the body; what energies or devas *illumine* it or are involved in the acts of sensation and cognition. Lastly, what is the highest. In the first chapter, it was taught that the Lord created all including Prāṇa and Rayi. After the creation, comes *preservation*. The questions that now follow relate to this. The Prāṇa has been declared to be the *best*, that statement would be *established* now in the subsequent questions and answers.

The Second Question deals with the powers of Prāṇa. It is this Chief Prāṇa that supports the microcosm as well as the macrocosm. He also illumines them, and is thus the best of all. This rivalry between the prāṇas and the prāṇa is spoken of in other Upaniṣads also. See Bri Up VI 1 7 to 13 and Chh. Up. V. 1. The superiority of Prāṇa is thus a well established fact and to all devotees this only Saviour, this Eka-Rīsi must always be an object of fervent love and gratitude.

The third Praśna shows that the Supreme Lord is not only the creator of the whole universe but as five-fold prāṇa rules the microcosm also.

The pentad called Prāṇa is of two kinds, the Higher Prāṇa pentad and the Lower Prāṇa pentad. From the Principal Prāṇa are born as His children, the Lower Prāṇa pentad. They are separate from the Prāṇa as individual entities. The Higher Prāṇa pentad is the five-fold aspect of the one and the same Prāṇa. As they are aspects of the chief Prāṇa, they are not separate and distinct from Him. The chief Prāṇa, (which always means the Higher pentad) appoints these Lower Pāṇa pentads—prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, samāna and udāna, each to his respective organ and function, and himself guides them. This the apāna aspect of the chief Prāṇa presides over the apāna of the Lower an so on.

Much confusion exists as to the proper functions of these five Vāyus. But from the verse III. 5 it would appear that Apāna is the vegetative or digestive function throwing out the effete matter from the body. Or it may be called the excretory life function. The Prāṇa is the sensory life functions since seeing, hearing, etc., depend upon it; the samāna is the assimilative function, by which the food taken in becomes assimilated to the tissues of the body, and would correspond with the lacteal circulation of the chyle.

The Samāna or the same-maker is thus connected with the respiratory function also. It constantly establishes the equipose between expiration and inspiration. It would correspond to the priest in a fire-sacrifice, while manas is the yajamāna for whom the sacrifice is made—and Udāna or hypnotic function is like the fruit of the action—that manifest in some future time. It is the upward carrying function—the function by which the jīva is separated from one vehicle after another: by which the self projects himself. The joy of the dreamless sleep depends upon Udāna.

Vyāna refers to the circulation of blood, and the nāḍis are the arteries and capillaries. They are all connected with the heart. The vyāna would thus correspond to the circulatory function of the blood through the arteries and veins, and its oxygenation in the lungs.

The ndāna function, though a well recognised one, has no physiological centre ascribed to it by modern science. The existence of the suṣumnā is considered as mythical. But man goes to sleep every day, and the Jīva leaves the body in deep sleep as well as in death. The energy that takes the jīva to region of deep sleep and out of the body should be recognised as a form of the Prāṇa. I have called it the hypnotic function of Prāṇa. It is a distinct and positive function and not a mere negative weariness of the nerves or exhaustion of vitality.

The Higher Prāṇa Pentad is cosmic, and governs through His five aspects the Lower Prāṇa Pentad in the Microcosm or the Jīva body.

The five energies appear to be correlated with the five elements and the five planes. This is a tentative table of these correspondences.

Cosmic.	Micro-cosmic.	Cosmic Plane.	Human Organ	Element.
PRANA ...	Prāṇa ...	Ātmic or Solar ...	The Light and other senses and optic and other centres of the senses in the brain and the whole brain.	Light (ether as ākāśa)
APĀNA ...	Apāna ...	Earth or physical	The intestines and other excretory organs.	Earth.
SAMĀNA...	Samāna...	Astral or antar-ikṣa.	The assimilatory organs, e.g. stomach, liver pancreas and lacteal circulatory vessels.	Water.
VYANA ...	Vyāna ...	Buddhic plane!	The heart and blood circulatory vessels.	Vāyu or Air.
UDĀNA ...	Udāna ...	Mental plane	The throat (?)	.. Fire.

Thus the five physiological prāṇas may be translated as :1. Sensory, 2. Excretory, 3. Assimilative, 4. Circulatory, 5. Hypnotic and Respiratory, or ejective functions.

In the previous praśnas, the entire universe has been proved to be under the Lord. All beings are under Him not only in their waking state, but in the dreaming and sleeping states also. The fourth chapter enunciates this truth. It is the jīva that goes to sleep, that dreams or enjoys the rest of the dreamless sleep. The devas that carry on the functions of the body, never sleep—they only cease to function. Some, however, never cease to function even.

The rays of the sun really never are withdrawn into the solar orb. It is only a conventional mode of speaking that the sun sets and the rays are withdrawn, for when the sun sets in one place, he is visible in another place. Therefore by the phrase 'the rays enter the sun when he sets,' it is meant that the sun becomes invisible in that particular locality.

Though the rays of the sun are never withdrawn into the solar orb and the sun never sets or rises, yet in relation to a particular place he is said to set and rise and people mistakenly assert that the rays have been withdrawn, or have come back again. The whole thing is an illusion or *artha* into which the people fall with regard to dream and sleep. Becoming one with Viṣṇu in sleep really means coming to the same place as Viṣṇu just as we say at night time all cows become one in the cowpen, i.e., they congregate in one place, while at day time they roam about in the pasture land. In the dream state they approach Viṣṇu, in the manas, in *Suṣupti* or dreamless sleep, they approach Him in the hollow of the heart, and as the sense-devās stop their activities then, the state of sleep arises. In dream, all sense-devās cease functioning except the manas.

The analysis of the verse IV. 8 will show the various tattvas so well known in the subsequent Indian literature. They are the *five STATES* or mahā bhūtas, the earth, water, fire, air and ether, the *five RATES* of vibration, named after these, the *ten Indriyas* or sense-organs, the *ten Viśayas* or objects of those sense-organs, the *five-fold* mind, namely, manas (lower mind), buddhi (Reason), chitta (memory), Ahamkāra (self-consciousness) and chetanā or consciousness or 35 in all. Manas is that which *cogitates*, should I do this or should I not do this. The Buddhi or Reason *determines* I must do this. Egoism or Ahamkāra is the idea of I-ness in a vehicle which is not the true I. (Asvarūpe svarūpatva buddhi). In other words, the false notion of freedom and independence. The real 'I' always *feels and knows* its entire dependence on God. The Chitta is evanescent, unstable memory. While chetanā or Tejas is the pervasion into the objects of chitta—consciousness thereof. The chetanā always deals with multitudes of notions. These are secondary objects or controlled or supported ones under the Īśvara—they are controlled by Him but indirectly. The principal subject or controlled one is the Prāṇa, the Life principle, the Great support of all the other principles like the earth, &c., while he himself is supported directly by Īśvara alone.

The Vedas denote knowledge—the Rig Veda would mean all the sciences dealing with the *physical* or objective plane; the Yajur-Veda—all the sciences dealing with the subtler or finer planes, the non-objective planes; and the Sāma-Veda—the knowledge or the science of God, the Theosophy or Brahma-vidyā. All sciences deal with mātṛās or measures, and the knowledge of all the vibratory measures of AUM leads to the knowledge of all the forces of nature. The Prāṇa is the key-note of the universe.

In a preceding chapter, it was shown that the Lord rules Prāṇa, &c., and all the jīvas in their three states of jāgrat (waking), svapna (dreaming), suṣṇpta (dreamless sleep). The sixth chapter shows that He rules them even when they are mukta or released. It further shows how Prāṇa, by His devotion and wisdom, has become the Great Saviour, the Mediator and the Prime Agent. It thus justifies the greatness of Prāṇa.

In the beginning of a new creation, the Lord meditated as to the best agent who would help Him in creation. He thought "Who is that Being who can, by his extreme devotion and love and wisdom, keep me, as if it were, under his control, whom must I make my instrument in this act of creation?" He found that Prāṇa was such an agent, one who by his devotion and wisdom, was fitted to be the co-worker with God. He is the Hiraṇyagarbha—the Golden Child the First-born.

He produced Prāṇa, from Prāṇa came Faith, ether, air, light, waters, earth, sense-organs, mind, and food. From food vigour, austerity, hymns, actions, worlds, and in the worlds, name.

Note—Thus Prāṇa is the first-begotten. Through Prāṇa, He created Śraddhā or Faith, the five elements, and the organs of cognition like the eyes, etc., and action like the hands, etc. Manas is the highest among these organs. The Lord creates every succeeding emanation or kalā, with the intermediation of the one preceding it. These kalās are not non-intelligent material substances, but denote here hierarchy of intelligences presiding over these.

Puṣkara presides over karma, the presiding deity of name is Uṣâ. Parjanya is the presiding deity of the lokas Svâhâ is the devatâ of the mantras. Vahni presides over Tapas, and Varuṇa over virya or seed, Soma presides over food, Aniruddhaka over the manas ; the Sun, etc., are the Lords of the Indriya or senses, presiding over the eyes, etc. Rudra, Vindra, Deṣa, and Kâma are devatâs of manas, Śraddhâs or faith is the consort of Prâṇa—she is the origin and dissolution of all. She controls all the subsequent emanations Prâṇa is the cause of Śraddhâ herself. He is thus superlatively excellent. While the Lord Vāsudeva is the cause of Prâṇa himself—the Supreme, the Changeless. There is no one like unto Him ; there is no one Higher than Him. Knowing Him the souls get salvation. He is higher than the high. (Tattva-viveka).

The order in which these hierarchies arise is given in another mantra (Mu. Up. II. 1. 3.) "From Him arise Prâṇas, Manas, all senses, âkāśa, air, fire, water, earth, the support of all" The order given in the Praśna Up. is not the standard. Manas does not arise from the senses (Note :—does not the activity of the mind arise after senses have supplied the material? This is also clearly laid down by Bâdarâyana in the Vedânta Sutra II 4. 3 From Viṣṇu arises (1) Prâṇa : from Him, (2) Śraddhâ, from her, (3) Rudra, the Lord of Manas, and otherwise called Manas, from him, (4) Indra, the devatâ of the senses, from him, (5) Soma, the devatâ of food, from Soma arises, (6) Varuṇa, from him, (7) the Higher Agni, from him arises (8) Vighna, the Devatâ of âkāśa, thence arises, (9) Marut, the son of Vâyu, from him arises, (10) the Lower Agni, called Pāvaka, the son of first Agni, thence, (11) Parjanya thence (12) Svâhâ, the Devatâ of mantra, from her, (13) Budha, the Lord of water, thence (14) Uṣâ, the goddess of Name thence (15) Śani, the Lord of earth, and (16) Puṣkara, the deity of karma Each succeeding is lower in order than the one preceding it. They maintain this gradation even when they become free from all guṇas, in the state of Mukti. The eternally free Viṣṇu is higher than Prâṇa even and is the best.

THE
MUNDAKA UPANISAD

THE MUṆDAKA UPANISHAD.

The words "Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad" literally mean "the Secret Doctrine (upaniṣad) for the shaved ones (Muṇḍaka)." Was the total shaving of the head, the mark of a monk among the Atharvans and is this which is referred to in the last verse of this Upaniṣad by the phrase Śiro-vrata "Vow of the head" ?

It is divided into three Muṇḍakas—Each one of which contains two Khaṇḍas or chapters.

The first Chapter opens with the statement that Brahmā was the first of the shining ones that came out of Viṣṇu at the beginning of a creative period, and that He is the First Teacher of the secret doctrine, the Theosophy, the Brahman-Vidyā. It then goes on to mention how this Brahma-Vidyā or Theosophy, is preserved for mankind by a Lodge that is coeval with creation and whose present Head is known by the name of Aṅgīrasa. An initiate called Saunaka is the questioner in this Upaniṣad : and he puts the enigmatical question what is that one science, one substance by knowing which everything else is known. Does there exist any science from whose principles the principles of all other sciences can be deduced ? The answer to that is : "Yes. There exists such a science. It is the science of the Syllable—Akṣara-Vidyā ; as distinguished from the science of the words." All sciences like the Physical (Rik), Theological (Yajus), Spiritual (Sāman)—Occult (Atharvan) are summed up in the science of the Syllable, the science of the Imperishable Akṣara-Vidyā. But this science is not contained in any particular book. All religious scriptures of every people—scriptures that have come from the Great Lodge—contain it ; but one must read these scriptures between the lines ; or rather between the Syllables (Akṣara) This reading between the syllables, known as Kabbalistic science in the West, is almost lost now in India. Every akṣara or letter had a numerical value as well as denoted a particular substance or quality. The sacred scriptures must be read with this key in order to understand their secret meaning. When the Scriptures are read in their exoteric sense, with the surface meaning, they are called Aparā. When read with this key of the Imperishable, they are turned into Parā Vidyā. All sacred scriptures have thus a two-fold meaning ; and hence the impossibility of translating them, and prohibition against translating them.

The Science of the Imperishable has some broad outlines, and it is these that the Muṇḍaka gives in its six chapters. The three Great Imperishables are God (Brahma), Soul (Karma), and Matter (Annam), the last two subordinate to the first.

The following verse (I. I. 4.) relates to Parā and Aparā Vidyās.

द्वे विद्ये वेदितव्ये इति हस्म यद्ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति परा
चैवापरा च ॥ ४ ॥

परा Parā, the Higher (Esoterio.) The teaching that refers to the Supreme. When a mantra is understood as applying to the highest. अपरा Aparā, the lower (the exoterio).

Two Sciences ought to be known, for thus say the knowers of Brahman, the higher and even the lower science.'—4.

Note.—The words conveying these teachings are not different. When higher and the principal meaning is read into them, it is called esoteric, when the scriptures are read in their ordinary meaning they are exoteric. The force of the word "Eva," in the above indicates that the things are not really two but one. When a person reads with the highest vehicle, which reveals to him the inner purport of the sacred book, the teaching becomes esoteric, but when he reads them with his lower intellect it is exoteric.

All Karmas are to be learnt from the Aparā Vidyā. When so learnt, this knowledge becomes perfected when it is supplemented by the knowledge of the Supreme Self, the subject of the Parā Vidyā. This answers the second question. Therefore the verse says : Two Vidyās ought to be known, &c.

The Verse I. 1. 7 describes the coming out of the Universe from the Imperishable.

यथोर्णनाभिः सृजते गृह्णते च यथा पृथिव्यामोषधयः संभवन्ति ।
यथा सतः पुरुषात्केशलोमानि तथाक्षरात्संभवतोह विश्वम् ॥ ७ ॥

As the spider stretches forth and gathers its together thread, as herbs grow out of the earth, as forth a living man come out the hair, so from the Imperishable out this universe.—7.

Note.—The illustration of the spider and its thread shows that the material universe is a reality by itself, not a Parīṇāma or modification of Brahman, and always remains outside of Brahman ; as the thread remains outside the spider, when he stretcheth it out, it is creation ; when he gathers it together and wraps it round himself, it is Pralaya or destruction. This shows that the material world is neither a modification (Parīṇāma) of Brahman, nor an illusion (vivarta) superimposed upon Brahman. The second illustration shows that jīvas also come out of Brahman ; as seeds remain latent under ground in the winter but burst forth into herbs and plants in the summer, so the jīvas remain latent in pralaya with their different karmas as their seeds, and come out at the time of creation, as trees of different kinds, but with their root always in Brahman. The third illustration shows that as out of a conscious man come out un-consciously and without any exertion on his part, hairs, nails, &c, so the jīvas and the lokas come out of Brahman without any effort on His part.

This also shows that by the mere thought of Brahman (not by any modification of it or by any vivarta in it) comes out Matter and Karmas or jīvas. The matter or annam gives rise to the seven lokas and triple powers, viz., Kriyā-śakti (Prāṇa) Jñāna-śakti (manas) and Ichchhā-śakti (Satyam). This on the side of form ; while among the karmas (jīvas) the Immortal Brahman himself takes up His residence. This verse further shows that the Prakṛiti and the jīvas are co-eternal with Brahman, together with the Logos or Brahmā.

Exoterically, in every Fire sacrifice two oblations are first made, on the right and left of the fire on the altar, when the fire is fully kindled. One on the right is offered with the words "agnaye svāhā" that on the left with

“somāya svāhā.” This offering to the two Eternals, Agni and Soma, must be made before any Deva can be invoked.

The offerings must be made when the fire is fully kindled, never when it is imperfectly kindled, or smoking, &c. The seven stages through which the fire passes before it is fully lighted and fit to receive *āhutis*, are described in the fourth verse.

When the Śruti says “perform karmas” it means perform acts which are religions, which are duties and not acts in general. The karmas thus include all acts taught in the Śruti; and cover the control of thought (Śama), control of conduct (Dama), tolerance, meditation, &c. The Karmas do not mean merely ritualistic karmas. The karmas thus are of many kinds: (1) The offering to the Devas (2) The study of sacred literature. (3) The offering to the ancestors. (4) The feeding of the stranger, &c. The Deva-Yajña or offering to the Devas is the type of all Karmas. It is performed by offering oblations to fire and its other name is Homa. The fire oblations are commenced by the offering of clarified butter (Ājya-bhāga) into fire. Then takes place offering of rice, cake, barley, sugar, scents, charn, &c. The ceremony is closed by another offering of clarified butter. Thus clarified butter (ghee) begins and ends all offerings—therefore the text says “between the two Ājyabhāgas all other offerings should be made.” This is then the method of all Homas—Ājya-bhāgas—other substances like Charu, &c., called *āhutis* and the second Ājya-bhāgas. A brahmachārī offers mere fuel to the fire. A householder should offer barley, rice, milk, curd, &c. All must offer according to the stage or āśrama in which they are.

Note—The person who in spite of being an adhikārī does not offer oblations to the fire, loses the advantage of getting the help of the Fire Devas in his passage to the Higher worlds.

Thus the Agnihotra with appropriate meditations, &c. is ordained for all men in the three āśramas. But this Agnihotra itself has several culminating periods or days, when ordinary daily offerings assume a little more gorgeous aspect. All the fortnightly, the monthly, the quarterly, the six-monthly or harvest offerings must be performed. Lest the daily Homa should degenerate into individualistic prayer service, and the congregational aspect of it be forgotten, the daily individualistic Homa must be supplemented by congregational service. The simplest of these is the fortnightly service called Darśā and paurṇamāsā—the New-moon and the Full-moon offerings. These are done in assemblies and not in the solitude of one’s family hearth. On these days one should throw open the door of his house to his neighbours, and invite them to participate with him in the worship of the Lord. The man who does not do so, who rests satisfied with his daily prayers, does not reap the full reward of the Agnihotra. Therefore the verse says “He whose Agnihotra is not accompanied by Darśā, &c., is as if he had not performed any sacrifice.” The Lord Agni (called Saptamān—the Septenary)—destroys the worlds of such a man, that is, obstructs the passage of that soul to higher worlds. Not only these congregational and seasonal services should be duly performed, but scrupulous attention should be paid to the proper discharge of the daily Agnihotra also. Not only this but other Yajñas also should be performed, such as, feeding the stranger, the Vaisṛadeva offering, the Śrāddha or offering to the Pitṛis, offering to the Bhūta, and the poor and all animate creation. In fact, the well-known Five Great sacrifices

should be performed by all who desire for their physical, moral and spiritual welfare

The Bhāgavatas^o who are kaumins are of two kinds : Apratikālabhanās : who worship without any symbol who do not take the help of any symbol : (2) Pratikālabhanās, those who take such help of symbol. The first class consists of Devas and others who see the Lord as All-pervading. All Devatās, one hundred among the Risis, one hundred among the Gandharvas belong to this class of Adhikāris. The Pratikālabhanās are of two kinds (1) Dehālabhanā and (2) Pratimālabhanā. Those who see the Lord in their body, they are Dehālabhanās. The Risis, &c, called Madhyama Adhikāris belong to this class. "They see the Atman in the Ātman (body)". While the Pratimālabhanās are those who see God in an image—who can not imagine Him without some form. Men belong to this class.

These homās—these sacrifices, gifts, penances, &c—carry him, the worshipper if he is an Apratikālabhanā to the abode of the Lord, namely to Vaikuṇṭha Loka, where the Lord of the Devas, i.e. Viṣṇu dwells for ages. If he is a Dehālabhanā Adhikāri, then those Homas carry him to Satyaloka, where dwells the Lord of the Devas, namely, Brahmanā, the Four-faced, If he is a Pratimālabhanā Adhikāri then these Homas carry him to Mahārjana or Tapas Loka. They (the Pratimālabhanās) dwell in these lokas for long æons. When the fire kindled by Sankarsana's Breath—the great Pralaya fire burns up the three lower planes, Bhur, Bhuvar, and Svar. the Mahār Loka becomes uninhabitable, and so they go leaving Mahār, Jana and Tapas Lokas to Satya Loka. The Karmas become fruitful of the highest results through Jñāna alone.

The question then arises, how can the Yajamāna go to Viṣṇu Loka when he is clothed in a body, for even after death, there remains a body in which the soul is clothed and Viṣṇu Loka is a place where no Prākṛitic matter can enter? This is answered by the second sentence—the Sūrya rays carry the soul. The word "Sūrya" means He who is attained by the Sūris or Wise—that is, the Supreme Lord Viṣṇu. The rays or powers of Viṣṇu carry the soul to Viṣṇu. These Viṣṇu rays carry the soul to that place where dwells the one Lord of the Devas. They carry the soul to the Heart where the Lord dwells. The first stage of death is that these Sūrya rays—these Divine rays (the web of Life)—carry the Jīva into the heart—and there they begin to glow into a steady flame. There in the heart, the Lord Viṣṇu carries His devotees outside the heart. as it said : "Then Viṣṇu with his light illumines the heart and the passage at its top, and through that goes out taking the Jīva with Him."

In the Kṛita age all acts were performed with this single motive—Satya kāmah—the desire of pleasing the True, the Lord. In the next age, the Tretā, the motive became diverse: the true Bhāgavatas still retained the highest motive—desire to please the Lord. The second class, the Ritualistic worshippers called Trividyaās, had the motive to attain Heaven; but even they at the end of all their acts uttered the formula "We offer the fruit of all our works to the Bhagavat." The third class, the haters of the Lord, omitted even the utterance of this formula and performed all acts with the simple motive of self-gratification. But those who desire in all their acts to please the Lord alone—who are Satya Kāmās—sedulously perform in every age (whether it be Tretā, Dvāpara or Kali) the dharma of the Kṛita age—with the object of pleasing the Lord alone. Therefore the Śruti says "O Satya Kāmās (in the

plural) perform ceaselessly good works with the highest motive : for work thus done is the only way to the abode of the Lord—this is the only way for you to obtain the knowledge of God. But if you perform acts like the Traividyās or like the haters of the Lord, then your place is either in this world or to some lower plane.” Thus threefold is the reward of Karma, according to the motive. With the highest motive—the Satya Kāma, the desire to please the Lord—the Karmin goes to the abode of the Lord, i.e., gets fitted to obtain the knowledge of God. When performed like the Traividyās with the desire of Heaven, the Karmin goes to Heaven after death, but is born again on this earth when the fruit of Karma is exhausted. The third class—the haters of the Lord, also go to the subtler plane after death, but their re-birth is in some lower plane.

When all yajñās, whether offerings to Agni or Vāyu or Soma, &c.—are performed in this spirit, as offerings to Viṣṇu, they become the highest Karmas and lead to unending lokas. But when Yajñās are performed as worship of inferior deities, they lead to finite lokas, from which there is a return and re-birth. Then these Yajñās instead of being a strong ship which could carry the sailor beyond the troubled sea of Samsāra, become adriḍhā plavāḥ—fragile rafts which bring disaster on those that try to cross the sea through their aid. All lower Yajñās aim at the three worlds excluding the three higher planes of the mental world even. The seven sub-planes of the physical Bhuḥ Loka, the seven sub-planes of the astral (Bhuvāḥ lokah), and the four sub-planes of the mental (called Rūpa—Svarga) form the 18 sub-planes of lower Yajñās. It is this 18 which is described in the second chapter. The three higher sub-planes of the mental are not reached by such yajñās; hence their transitory and phenomenal nature. These lower yajñās are performed with the eighteen only, namely, with the Sūkṣma Śāstra (consisting of the well-known 17 elements) and āhnikāra. The higher manas or Vijñāna does not enter into their performance. Hence they are deprecated. But when Yajñās are performed with Vijñāna, they lead to immortal worlds. Moreover these lower Yajñās are performed under a partial and superficial understanding. The 18 Scriptures or sources of knowledge are enumerated in the following verse — The four Vedas, the six Vedāṅgas, the Purāṇas, Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, the Dharma Śāstras, the Āyur Veda, the the Dhanur Veda, Gāndharva Veda and Political Economy are the eighteen classes of Science.” Therefore it is said the Yajñās taught by the eighteen sciences are inferior and lead to transitory results. See also Chhāndogya Up VII Prapāthika where these 18 Sciences are enumerated. The enumeration in this Upanisad is incomplete. The soul is carried to those worlds by the rays of the sun. The soul is not immaterial though atomic. The Jīva is no doubt an amśa or part of God, spark of divine fire, but a spark encased in matter. The covering of the soul in its most pristine state even has an atom of the matter of all the planes, mental, astral and physical. These are the permanent atoms that constitute the body of the soul—the undying Lingadeha which drops only when Mukti is obtained. This ātmik body is carried to its appropriate heaven by the solar rays. The heaven may be on a physical globe like the earth or on a globe of non-physical matter but the solar rays (physical or super physical) are the vehicles through which the souls pass from globe to globe, sphere to sphere, one plane to another. The good that men do in this life become thought-forms, living entities in the interior subtler planes. If a man thinks high thoughts, performs noble actions, sacrifices his own interests to the interests of the community; his thoughts,

words and deeds create a host of elemental forms, called thought-forms. These welcome the soul when it leaves the body and proceed towards the heaven plane. The devas of those planes also join in welcoming him ; such souls are carried beyond the Triloki (Bhuh, Bhuvah and Svar—Physical, Astral and Mental) to one of the three higher planes.

But the souls of the ordinary good people, who perform mere Yajñas without love of God, go the round of birth and death in the Triloki. Karmas may be performed with various motives ; but these latter may be broadly divided into three classes—Divine, Human and Demoniac. The divine motive is that when a man does all acts as acts of sacrifice, for the sake of the Lord and to carry out His Will, without asking for any reward. Such Karmas lead the soul beyond Triloki. Human Karmas are performed with the motive of reward—enjoyment of heaven or worldly prosperity. Such Karmas carry the soul to one of the heavens of the Astral or Mental planes. Demoniac motive makes a man do a Karma with the pure and simple object of injuring another. It leads the soul to lower worlds. "Fia! are these rafts of sacrifice"—is a sentence applied to the second class of Karmas. Such Karmas do not lead to mukti, but to a transmigratory existence. The karmas taught in the eighteen topics mentioned above are, therefore, transitory in their results when not illumined and directed by the right motive. The second Chapter thus teaches the Great Laws of Karma and Re incarnation and the planes in which they find their scope. The Triloki (Physical, Astral and Lower mental) is the field of karma—the Kurukṣetra where takes place the eighteen days' fight of the eighteen Akṣauhini of army corps. The number eighteen thus appears to be the type and symbol of the Karmic planes. The planes of Jñāna are above these.

The second Chapter of the first Muṇḍaka deals with the third Imperishable, namely, Matter, Karma or the eternal chain of Causation, Yajñas or the employment of the forces of nature to bring about certain results—all deal with Matter and her forces. These forces on the plane of Unity—called the Kṛita Plane or the plane of Buddhi of the Theosophical literature—are not diverse. It is one force there. As the current comes down into the three lower planes—called the Tretā, Dvāpara and Kali—the Third, Second and First plane—it branches off into various kinds. But even on the lowest plane (physical) we can see the unity of forces—the transformation of energy is a great proof of this. This is the meaning of the phrase "the Karmas which the sages saw in the Kṛita became diverse in the Tretā, etc."

The Veda was one before, like one caste—subsequent ages have divided the Veda into four, as subsequent evolution divided the one Brāhmaṇa caste into the variety of castes and races of the world. The first key, therefore, to the interpretation of the Vedas (and as a matter of fact of all sacred scriptures) is this idea of unitary force. All the so-called Gods of the Vedas—Indra, Agni, Vāyu, Marut, etc.—are but different names of one God Viṣṇu. Ekam sad Viprah bahudhā vadantī. Agni means Viṣṇu. Vāyu means Viṣṇu. Indra means Viṣṇu and so on. This was in the Kṛita age. With the progress of time, the words degenerated. Agni which meant Viṣṇu before now came to mean the Deva of a high order, presiding over a hierarchy called "The Hierarchy of Fire" and so with Vāyu and other Vedic terms. This was in the Tretā age. In the Dvāpara, a further degeneration took place in the meaning of this word—it came to mean the elementals of Fire. While in this

Kali age, Agni means fire—the physical fire. The history of the meaning of this term from the Vedic up to the present time shows through what stages this word has passed, and how corruption gradually has set in.

The First Law, therefore, by which we can find out the Esoteric meaning of the scriptures is to take all these worlds to mean Viṣṇu the Supreme God. The Corollary that follows from it is that all Yajñas or religious and occult ceremonies must be addressed to Viṣṇu. He alone should be worshipped and no inferior deity.

Those men whose nature is that of the Kṛita age should worship Viṣṇu alone as God. Yāga means offering of anything with recitation of mantras in honour of any Devatā. So when a Yāga is performed in honor of Viṣṇu and Vedic mantas are recited therein, those mantras must necessarily apply to Viṣṇu, in order to be appropriately used in a Viṣṇu Yāga. Since all Vedic Mantras can be employed in Viṣṇu Yāga, consequently all Vedic Mantras must denote Viṣṇu, otherwise they cannot be so employed. For example, we cannot employ an Agni Mantā in offering Yāga to Vāyu or Indra, as individual Devatās of those names; but Kṛita Yāga people employed all mantras whether addressed to Agni, Vāyu, Indra, &c, in offering Yāga to Viṣṇu. Their conduct, therefore, showed that by Agni, Vāyu, &c, they understood Viṣṇu and these words had this connotation in that age. The words, however, have a tendency to change their meaning, some time for the better, some time for the worse. In course of time these words came to mean different persons.

If Viṣṇu alone was worshipped as God, then it follows that either Brahmā and others should never be worshipped at all, or should never be worshipped as God. This objection, Madhva answers by saying they should also be worshipped in the sense of “honoured, as we honour our elders and benefactors as a mark of love and gratitude; but they should never be worshipped as God.” In the Kṛita age also, Brahmā and others were worshipped, i.e., honoured as Gurus—Great Ones, Teachers. The above passage does not prohibit their worship, or paying respect to them, but it teaches that they should never be worshipped as God. It should further be remembered that some fallen Devatās bear also the name of Brahmā, &c. they must not be worshipped, even in this secondary sense: as says a text: “one should never worship the fallen (apa bhraṣṭa) and the nondevās, though they may bear the name of Brahmā, &c., the word *deva* is applied to them in the sense of *dina* or poor.” The Devas like Brahmā, &c, bear the name of Manu also, because they possess intelligence (manas).

The first khaṇḍa of the second Mundaka teaches the Truth about the Jīvas or souls, as the preceding Chapter taught the truth about the Yajñas or occultism in its two-fold aspects, the lower and the higher. The last chapter thus dealt with matter (Prakṛiti) and its various forces and the planes and how to control them. As the Prakṛiti is true, so also the Jīvas are true. All Jīvas have the same nature (svarūpa) as Brahman; like sparks and the fire. God made the man after His own image (Svarūpa).

The Divya Puruṣa or the Īvara has no Prākṛitic body and consequently no such Prāṇa or Manas, because they come out of him. He is higher than the other two Imperishables—the Prakṛiti and the Puruṣa (Jīvas) or the Prakṛiti; and the Śrī Tattva.

Because the Person, the Lord has a Divine body consisting of knowledge and bliss He is without a physical body; because he has senses made up of knowledge and bliss, he has no ordinary Prāṇa and Manas. Because He is outside and inside of all objects therefore He is unlimited, though having a body. But as He has no physical body, His activities are not followed by fatigue, weariness, anxiety or worry. But being outside He creates all external objects, by living inside He produces the pleasure, &c, of all beings. The objection often raised how can a Being without body, create anything, is answered by saying that the Lord has a divine body. The objection that if He has a body He must be limited, is answered that He is both in and out. His body has no limitations. The third objection that if He has a body, he must be born, die, &c, is answered by saying because He is unborn, so He is above all such vicissitudes. In fact, He has not a Prākritic body. On the contrary, He controls the Prakṛiti and its Devatā Lakṣmī and this is shown by saying He is higher than the High Imperishable. The Imperishables are three, (1) Aparam, the Lower Imperishable, the Jada Prakṛiti, (2) Paramam, the High Imperishable, the Śrī Tattva, (3) Parataḥ Param, the Higher than the High Imperishable, the Lord Himself.

The seventeen come out of the Brahman—namely, the five elements, the ten Indriyas and the Prāṇa and the Manas. These seventeen include all the form side of creation: and they come out of the body of Īśvara. His various members (angas) give birth to these. This is the anga-Creation, in which no help is taken from the Śrī-tattva. The next verse explains it further showing from what part of Īśvara these come out.

Thus dyu comes from the root div “to sport,” “to shine” and when the Upaniṣad says “The dyu is His head,” it means that the head of the Lord has power of illumination, &c. Secondly, the word dyu means “heaven” only in a secondary sense. Similarly the word “Agni” means the guide of the world (literally “agā”—the immovable world, and “ni” to guide). Similarly “Chandra” means primarily “the delight-giver” and “Sūrya” the “goal of the Suis or wise.”

This shows how the various angas of the Divya Puruṣa are co-related with the cosmos. The word Viśva, in the above, literally means the All, the Universe and refers to the manas. The manas arises from the heart of the Divya Puruṣa, as the prāṇa comes out of the Vāyu or breath or energy of the Divinity.—The word of the Divya Puruṣa generates Agni or the essence of fire, the seventh principle or Jīva. The eye generates the sun and the moon—the mind and the emotions and so on. These represent the various parts of Īśvara that go to form the vehicles of a man.

The verse fourth shows the Anga—Śṛiṣṭi—how from the various members of the body of the Lord, the different Devas came out. The various members of the body of the Lord are known by these names of Agni, Chandra, Sūrya, Diśa, &c.

The verse II 15 describes the creation of the Jīvas. The last verse described the Anga-Śṛiṣṭi—how the various planes (Kosus) came out of the different members of the Primeval Person. This describes the production of the Jīvas by the joint co-operation of Vāsudeva and Rāmā. The Jīvas

which were withdrawn at the time of the Pralaya into the body of the Lord, are now thrown out in the womb of *Ramā*, the Highest *Tatva*, called also the *Sri Tatva*. Thus are produced many grades of *Jīvas* from that *Purusa*. Compare the *Gītā* where *S'ri Kṛṣṇa* says "I am the seed-giver" (XIV 4).

This shows the *Sūkṣma* creation. The bodies of *Devas* like *Virīñcha*, &c., are of *Sattva* matter. The verses 2 and 3 described the creation of the *Tattvas*, the verse 4 described the *Anga-Sṛiṣṭi*, and this verse describes the *Sūkṣma Sṛiṣṭi* or subtle emanation of the Lord.

The next verse II-1-6 again describes the ten-fold *Anga-Sṛiṣṭi*. The four *Vedas*, the ceremonial and spiritual magics, the law of *dakṣinā*, the æonic periods, and the two Heavens of the pious obtained by the path of the Sun and the Moon (the *Deva Yāna* and the *Pitri Yāna*) come out from the Lord. This represents the creation of Cosmic Intelligences. The ten *Vidyās* enumerated here have some analogy with the ten *Vidyas* of 1. 5.

As applied to the *Jīva*, the four *Vedas* represent the *Manomayakosa* (see *Taitt. Up* II 3, 2), the *Yajña*, the *kratu*, the *Dakṣinā* and *Samvatsara* represent the *Vijñānamayakosa*, with *śāddhā*, *ṛitam*, *satyam* and *yoga* as its four-fold division. (*Taitt. Up* II 4, 2) while *Yajamāna* represents the Self-Consciousness. The *Jīva* is a triad of *Ahaukāra* (Self-Consciousness), *Buddhi* (or moral and ethical nature) and *Manas*; or in other words, *Will* = *Yajamāna* feeling (*Buddhi-Yajña*, *kratu*, &c.) and cognition (= *Manas*).

The creation of the *Vedas* with its auxiliaries was mentioned in verse 4 also. Their creation is again described here. This is, however, not a tautology; for in the fourth verse the *Vedas* in their *undivided* form were taken, here they are taken in their *divided* form—the form they assumed in the *Tretā* and other ages. By saying that the *Rik*, &c. came into existence is meant that the names of *Rik*, *Yajus*, &c. came into existence then.

The words 'Sun, Moon and Wind' refer to the *Sūrya*, *Chandra* and *Vāyu* *Lokas*. They include the other *Lokas* also not specially mentioned here, but which are on the Path of Light.

The verse II 17 shows the fourteen fold creation produced by the Primeval *Purusa* with the help of the Female Principle called the *S'ri Tatva*.

Applied to the *Jīva*, it shows that all the active functions are created from this union of *Īśvara* and *Śrī*—while the vehicles come from the body of *Īśvara*—the functions or energies or faculties have a dual or "sexual" origin. The highest spiritual faculties like abstinence, faith, endurance, truth, loyalty—and the lowest vegetative functions like growth and reproduction (*vṛhi* and *java*)—all come out of this union.

As the *Jīvas* have to acquire the experience of the seven planes, they are endowed with seven Life energies, the seven senses, the seven bodies, and the seven relations. In every world there is this seven-fold division. Thus the *Prāṇas* become 49 or the well-known forty-nine *Vāyus*. See *Vedānta Sūtra*, II. 4-5.

In ordinary men the action is different from the agent, the knowledge is different from the knower, the qualities different from the thing qualified—not so, however, in the case of the Lord.

So also we have S'ruti :—“Wisdom, Power and Action are His essential nature” (S'vetâsoatara 1.6).

The mantra II 1 10 describes the Third Truth—the Truth about the Lord, the Supreme Brahman; as the previous mantras described the Truth about the Jîva; and the Khanda preceding that, the Truth about Yajñas and the Cosmos. Cosmology and Psychology are the subjects of those two Khandas. This verse, which properly stands at the head of Khanda fourth, deals with Îśvara or Brahman.

The creative act (karma) of the Lord, and his tapas (knowledge) are not different from the Lord. He and His activities are one. The Lord, the S'akti and the Wisdom are one. All the acts of the Lord (such as creation &c.) His Wisdom called Tapas, and the Brahman called Eternally Free (Paiâmritam)—all is verily Lord. (They are not different from Him) O Somya! He who knows Him thus, as resting in the cavity of the heart easily unloosens the bonds of ignorance.

According to the Second Chapter of the Second Muṇḍaka, the avidyâ covers both Îśvara and Jîva. It prevents Îśvara being seen by Jîva and Jîva seeing Îśvara. It is a direct bondage of Jîva, and a metaphorical fetter of Îśvara. Avidyâ is the name given to Prakṛti in her active state. when her three qualities, Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas, are actively manifest. Destruction of Avidyâ means putting these guṇas in their latent state. There is a great difference between the destruction of the Avidyâ—fettters as taught in this verse, and the unloosening of them as previously described in verse 1. There Avidyâ still remained, for it was merely a Paroksa or intellectual apprehension of Truth. Here Avidyâ itself is destroyed by aparoksa or Intuitive knowledge of Brahman.

The bonds or bandhas are five: the lowest is Avidyâ-bond, then the Lînga deha-bond, then the Paramitihâdiki-Prakṛti-bond, the Kâma-bond and the Karma bond. When all these bonds are destroyed, then the Jñânî goes by the Path of Light to the Sântânika Loka. Before proceeding further all have to salute S'îsu mâra—the Dweller on the threshold,—the hub of the universe.

The S'îsu mâra *literally* means the Infant killer and means the porpoise and is the name of a constellation, in the north, near the Pole. It corresponds, perhaps, with the Draco or the Ursa Minor. For a fuller description of it, see Bhâgavad Purâṇa, Book 5, Chapter 23. Here it has a mystical reference to a Being of an exalted order, which every Jñânî passes by, in his way beyond this universe. It may correspond with the ring pass not of the “Secret Doctrine.” It is the name of Hari also, as we find in the following verse: “The Supreme Hari, the support of infinity of worlds and who is called S'îsu-mâra, is saluted by all knowers of Brahman on their way to the Supreme God.”

The third Muṇḍaka deals with Mukti or Release and how to obtain it. Thus, meditation or dhyāna is said to be the method to find out the nature of the Lord by aparokṣa. Some accessories are described to such meditation such as truthfulness, penance, oṣṭhacy, &c.

Jñānins must perform karmas. Such action is not merely for the sake of welfare of the world. (Gītā III. 20 and 25.) : but for the sake of attaining bliss. The works like S'āvaṇa, &c, performed without any desire of fruit, after one has attained parokṣa, as well as aparokṣa jñāna, lead to this beatitude of self-perception : the Ānanda transcending all Ānandas. This is not a mere assertion but there is authority for it. The word "ān" indicates this : "By jñāna is produced the cessation of all the sorrows and doubts ; but by worship and actions performed with bhakti after the attainment of wisdom there arises the bliss of the Self." Meditation leads to direct and intuitive knowledge. The accessories to such dhyāna are truthfulness, &c. The Yatis—the strivers after meditation, &c., (not necessarily Sannyāsins, the householders may be Yatis in this sense) freed from faults, see the Lord within the Self. This Lord is light, effulgent, pure, untainted by Matter—the Ātman—the Self.

In the last book of the Vedānta Sūtras, four kinds of release (Mukti) have been taught : viz., the destruction of the fruits of action (Karmas), the destruction of the final body, the path and the enjoyment. The first kind of Mokṣa or Karma Kṣaya has been taught in the verse 11 (Kṣiyante cha asya Karmāṇi), when the aparokṣa knowledge is obtained.

The second class of Mukti is of two sorts—the Charama-Deha nāśa, of the Devas, and the Charama-Deha nāśa of the perfects other than the Devas. The falling off of the body of the Deva occurs only at the great Cosmic Pralaya, and even then it is not a falling off. The Devas merge with their bodies into the body of the higher Deva of their hierarchy and so on. This is fully described under verse III. 2, 6. In the case of the Jñānīs other than the Devas (such as the human Jñānīs, Rṣis, &c.) the falling off of the last body takes place when they die, not to be re-born, when they transcend the circle of Saṃsāra. This is their last compulsory incarnation on Earth. When they throw off their Charama-Deha, they go to Mahar or other higher Lokas by the path of Archis. This has been described under verse I. 2, 6.

The Mārga or the path is also of two kinds—the path on which the Devas get Mukti called the path of Garuḍa, and the path of Śeṣa—and the path on which other than the Devas attain salvation, called the path of Arohis. The paths of Garuḍa and Śeṣa are described in the verse III. 2, 6, while the second path by which Brahman is attained is described in the next verse.

The Jñānīs are also of three kinds,—the highest, the middle and the lowest. The Devatās are the highest, the Rṣis the middling, and the lowest are the best of the human race. The Jñānīs—human or Divine—are subdivided into three classes. Those who worship without symbol (apratik-ḥambana) are the highest, because they see God everywhere as all-pervading. The other two classes are described later. They (the human Jñānīs of the highest kind) go by the path of Light (Archis). In a particular evolutionary period only a limited number reach this stage. All Devatās are generally of this class : among the Rṣis one hundred, among the Rājas

one hundred, among Gandharvas one hundred. The dead on leaving the body go to the Arçhis (flame) From that place they reach the son of Vāyu, called the Ativāhika. from there to Ahar (Day), then the Bright Fortnight, then the six northern months, then the year, then the lightning, Varuṇa, Prajāpati and Sūrya, thence Soma (moon), Vaiśvānara, Indra, Dhruva, Devī and Diva. Thence they reach the Supreme Vāyu (the first-begotten) who carries them to God

The Vision of God is entirely a matter of grace When the Son of God—called Vāyu—becomes gracious, the Father is seen. No one has seen the Father but through the Son See Vedānta Sūtra III 2 26. The various devas like Indra and others, cannot give this vision except when they act as channels of the Supreme Thus they (devas) are not useless—indirectly they can also lead to Mukti.

The organs like the eye, &c, cannot give the knowledge of Brahman, nor can speech or revelation give God-Vision nor can any other devas Because by penance and by sacrifices, He cannot be seen, because the adhikāri whose heart is pure, and who meditates on Him, who is free from 16 parts, cannot see Him through the grace of any other deity, therefore the necessity of grace, for by the grace of Wisdom, namely, of Vāyu, or of Chaturmukha Brahmā or of Supreme Wisdom Hari himself, can Brahman be seen Brahman is seen only through grace and grace alone

In the verse satyameva jayate (III 1 6) it was mentioned that the devotees called apratikālabhāna go direct to Vaikuntha and attain Mukti. Now in the verse III 2 5 is shown the method of the Mukti of Pratikālabhāna devotees They do not at once go out of Brahmānda to Viṣṇu Loka (Vaikuntha), but after some time In fact, all jñānins, to whatever class they may belong, go out of Brahmānda sometime or other The word "sarvataḥ" in the verse refers to Dehādeḥ understood, i.e., freed completely from all dehas or bodies. The word "body" refers to the charama-deha or the ultimate body Human jñānins throw off their ultimate body—the last body—on attaining Mukti, not so the Devas They attain Mukti, but do not throw off their charama-deha at the same time It is only at the time of the great cosmic Pralaya—Parānta kāla—that the Devas lose their final body The worshippers of so-called Nirguṇa Brahman (who are really worshippers of Eka-guṇa only) also belong to this category. They have no special path assigned to them: but with the dropping down of their physical bodies owing to disease, &c, they become free from all dehas Thus there is some similarity between the Devas and Nirguṇa (Eka-guṇa) upāsakas The Eka-guṇa Upāsakas have already, while in the body, become free from the bonds of karma, &c, like the Devas; and wait only for the falling off of the material deha to become completely free, as the Devas wait for the falling off of the body of Brahmā to gain final liberation. The eka-guṇa upāsakas never go to Vaikuntha Loka, but get liberation on earth They are also included in the word "te," "they," of the verse.

At the time of Pralaya, all jñānins together with Brahmā enter into the Supreme Self in his "Earth-abiding (pārthiva) form," then with the latter into his "Water-abiding form," then with the latter into the "Fire-abiding form," then with the latter into his "Vāyu-abiding form," then with the last they enter into the "Ākāśa-abiding form," thence into the "Buddhi-abiding form,"—thence with it to the "manas dwelling form"—thence into the

Buddhi-abiding Hari, thence into the Ahankāra-abiding Hari, thence into the Vijñāna-abiding (mahattatva) Hari, thence into the Avyakta-abiding (Ānanda-abiding) Hari. Thus reaching Hari in the final abode they never come back." Leaving the jñānins abiding within the cosmic Egg go out of it, by successively leaving the various coverings of tattvas which surround the Egg. These tattva-spheres must be passed through, and when it is done, then the Released Souls enjoy all happiness whether inside the Brahmāṇḍa or outside.

The Pratika Upāsakas go to the four-faced Brahmā but not so the apratika-upāsakas. The Rsis are all Pratika-ālabana. and are madhyama adhikāris. They possess inner light and see God inside. "Pratika is the body. Those who see the Lord in the body are called pratika upāsaka." While Human adhikāris are Bahih-prakāśā they see the Lord outside. To men the Lord appears in incarnations (avatāras). Strictly speaking, Human adhikāris cannot be called pratika-ālabana: but pratika-ālabana in the sense that they worship the Lord as manifested in an external body or pratika. Thus the Pratika-ālabana become of two sorts:—Deha-ālabana and Pratika-ālabana: the first applying to the Rsis, and the second to the Human perfect.

Both classes of Pratika Upāsakas—the Rsis and men—go to Brahmā. The difference however is this. The Rsis (who are Dehālabana) go by the path of archis (flame), &c., at once to Brahmā without staying in the intermediate lokas. But not so the Human-best, the Pratima-ālabana. They stop at the intermediate Lokas—some in the Mahar Loka, some in the Jana Loka, and some in the Tapa Loka. After some time—more or less according to their evolution—they reach Brahmā in His Satya Loka.

The jñānins are of three kinds—high, middling and low. The apratika-ālabanas are the high, because they see God as all-pervading. They at once go to Satya Loka or to the true. The Pratika-worshippers are of two sorts. Deha-ālabana and Pratika-ālabana. The Rsis, &c., belong to the deha-ālabana class, and are madhyama (middle class) jñānins because they see Brahman in the body. The best among men are adama (low) jñānins; they are pratima-ālabana because they see the avatāra of God outside their own bodies, in symbols, men, &c. Of those; the Dehālabanas reach the Brahmā of Satya Loka and being taught by him, get perfect satisfaction of knowledge, and become full of the wisdom gained of the immediate perception of self-bimba.

The Human-best also are subdivided into three classes—high, middle, low. The high or first class consist of those who are in constant unbroken meditation and contemplation (dhyāna) of God. Such meditation is called Tapas. They go to Tapas Loka. The second class Human perfects are also in unbroken meditation—but it is the meditation of Yoga and not Tapas. By this practice of Yoga they go to Jana Loka. for Yoga leads to Jana Loka. The third class Human perfects are those who possess partial Yoga (a quarter only), but are also in unbroken meditation. They go to Mahar Loka. These three classes of Human perfects reach the Satya Loka after some time, and when they reach it, they are taught by Brahmā and thus become jñāna-triptas.

Thus, the pratika-ālabanas (consisting of Dehālabanas and Pratima-ālabanas) reach the higher planes within the Brahmāṇḍa or cosmic Egg. Both the pratika and the apratika worshippers go out of the Cosmos and see the form of the Lord which is outside.

THE
MĀṆDUKA UPANIṢAD

THE MĀNDUKA UPANIṢAD.

The Mānduka is an Upaniṣad of the Atharva Veda. It has not been translated by Max Müller, nor is it referred to by Sankara or Rāmānuja in their commentaries on the Vedānta Sūtras. It is, however, one of the classical Upaniṣads and Sankara has left a commentary on it. It has been translated into English by Dr. E. Roer in the Bibliotheca Indica series

According to Madhva, this Upaniṣad is called Mānduka because it was revealed by a frog (Maṇḍuka) Varuṇa, the Lord of the Seas, assuming the form of a frog praised Hari with the hymns of this poem

This Upaniṣad contains twelve verses. But S'rī Madhva reads the Kārikās, passing under the name of Gaṇḍapāda, as part of the text itself.

This short Upaniṣad gives the secret meaning of Om, which is the name of the Lord, who has four aspects. In His aspect as Viśva, He makes the waking consciousness of the jīvas, and establishes relations between the jīva-consciousness and external objects. In His aspect as Taijasa, He withdraws the jīva consciousness from the external object, and revives the internal impressions and makes him see dreams. In His third aspect as Prajñā, He stops all consciousness of the jīvas and makes them enjoy rest and bliss. In His aspect as Turiya He gives them mukti. The letters ॠ, ॡ, ॢ, and the Nāda correspond with these four aspects. When a note is struck the overtone which merges into laya is the Nāda of that tone. When Om is properly pronounced the vibration produced by it is the Nāda. The mystical powers acquired by the right use of A U M are eightfold—four relating to the vehicles or bodies and four relating to consciousness or Life.

This Upaniṣad gives an analysis of consciousness on all planes. When a monad perceives the objects of a plane, that is called waking consciousness—whether those objects exist on the physical or astral or mental or any higher plane. When external objects are shut off from consciousness, and there is a revival of the impressions existing in his vehicles—in his brains—whether physical, astral, &c—that state of consciousness, is called svapna or dream. Of course, sometimes in sleep the soul goes out of the body and sees things existing in other places and times. These visions *appear* like dreams, but psychologically they are not dreams. The soul perceives here something *external*, and so it is a *waking* consciousness.

The third state of consciousness is the sleep or neutral or absence of consciousness. It is the laya centre of consciousness—a point which the consciousness must cross in order to pass to a higher state.

The fourth is that higher state of consciousness—which is called Turiya or Fourth.

Thus when passing from the physical *waking* consciousness to astral, the stages are—1st, the stoppage of physical impressions, 2nd, Revival of brain impressions or dreams, 3rd, Crossing the neutral line, the line or point between the physical and the astral, 4th, Waking up on the astral plane, being Mukta or free from the trammels of the physical consciousness altogether.

Similarly, when passing from the astral consciousness to the mental, again there are these stages. Here the waking or jāgrat is the astral consciousness. The jīva that performs Samādhi on the astral plane, first puts a stop to the astral waking state, the objects of the astral plane do not make any impression on his astral senses. Then his astral brain becomes active and he dreams astrally. Then the neutral point is reached, the point between the astral and the mental planes; and here an inversion (to borrow a figure of speech from Optics) of consciousness takes place and the mental consciousness is reached. The soul becomes mukta from the trammels of the astral consciousness and wakes upon the mental plane. He perceives now the objects of the mental plane, and this is his jāgrat consciousness. The jīva now practises Samādhi on the mental plane, and through the above steps rises to the Buddhi plane. Thus in passing from one plane to another, these four and only four stages occur. The consciousness of a higher plane is Turiya, the consciousness of the plane lower to it is Jāgrat: between these two is the dream and the mental consciousness. These terms—waking, 'dreaming,' 'transcendental'—are therefore relative terms. These will have a higher or lower meaning according to the plane on which the jīva is consciously awake, and the degree of Mukti (or Initiation) he has attained.

